

# COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. IX. No. 16.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 19, 1806.

[PRICE 10D.]

"That, by such immoderate waste of the property of his employers (the East-India Company), and by such scandalous breach of his fidelity to them, it was his intention to gain and secure the attachment and support of a multitude of individuals, by whose united influence, interest, and intrigues, he hoped to be protected against any future inquiry into his conduct." Article VII. Impeachment against Warren Hastings.

545]

## SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

**AFFAIRS OF INDIA.** (Continued from pages 171, 197, 237, 303, 368, 460, and 530.) In page 531, being part of the article last referred to, the history of Mr. HUDLESTONE's intended motion for laying before the House of Commons a Dispatch of the East India Directors, was given. It was, in conclusion, stated, that there was no doubt entertained, that Mr. Hudlestone's motion would *now* be made. But, from what has since passed in parliament, this opinion appears to have been too sanguine; for, it is ascertained, that Mr. H. has abandoned his intention. From what *motive* this abandonment has taken place, I shall not pretend to determine; and, indeed, the thing itself is immaterial, except as another proof of the state in which the East India Directors are held by the ministry of the day; for, if I am rightly informed, the Dispatch has gotten abroad, and will shortly make its appearance in print, which circumstance, however, is not to abate our sentiments with regard to the efforts that have been made to keep it from the eye of the parliament and of the people, who are now called upon for such immense sums of money to make up for the wasteful expenditure in India. — Of the propriety of producing this paper to the House of Commons, there can, I think, be no doubt, in the mind of any man, whose faculty of judging has not been completely perverted by the long habit of endeavouring to screen men from the effects of real responsibility. — The East India Company make (as we have before seen) a contract with the nation, according to which contract, the Company, in consideration of vast advantages secured to them at the nation's expense, are to pay to the nation 500,000*l.* a year. They have paid this sum but *one* year out of *thirteen*; and, instead of paying the rest, they come to the nation for money to aid them. *Three millions* have the ministers already raised upon us in taxes to give them; and, no one denies that much more will be wanted, in order to rescue the

[546

Company from that "*brink of beggary*," one of the Directors has represented them to be in at this moment, though *two* of the millions, observe, have been long ago received by them from us. In this state of things certain members of the House of Commons wish to obtain information as to the *causes* which have led to this result, and the more especially, because the affairs of the India Company have, during the whole of the 13 years, been annually represented to the parliament as *increasing in prosperity*. One member of parliament, in particular, imputes the blame to the late Governor General, who, he has repeatedly asserted, has involved the Company and the country in these difficulties, by having undertaken unnecessary and unauthorised wars, and by having made great waste of the money of his employers. The ministers, or, at least, some of them, assert, that the Governor General acted with the approbation of those employers; and, in more than one instance, such assertions have been accompanied with motions for papers to shew that the assertions were true. The East India Company, by their representatives, the Directors, make contrary assertions; and, in order to prove, that the Governor General acted, in the cases alluded to, not only without their approbation, and against their wishes and their will, but, in many instances, against their positive orders conveyed to and received by him, one of them, Mr. Hadlestone, gives notice of his intention to move for the important dispatch in question, and which dispatch the reader will find described in the preceding sheet, page 531 — Now, I ask the reader, what can be more just and more reasonable than this? And, can he possibly be at a loss to determine, what must be the principal motive, on the other side, for wishing to prevent this paper from seeing the light? I beg him, too, to bear in mind, that Lord Temple, and other defenders of Lord Wellesley, have repeatedly boasted, that, such was the goodness of his cause, his friends wished for the production



and the publicity of every document at all connected with his conduct!—Here, before I proceed to state what has, since my last, occurred, with regard to this great subject, I must stop to notice a letter, which will be found in page 600 of this number, signed J. S. W. The writer, in adverting to my repeated representation, that the East India Company is *indebted* to the nation to the amount of 6 millions, together with the interest thereon accruing, at the rate of 15 per centum per annum, says that I am in error; because, says he, the bargain, for the payment to the nation, of half a million a year, was not positive, but conditional: and, the condition was, that the said half million a year should be paid out of the surplus, after other named charges had been duly defrayed. Agreed, as far as he goes; but, was there no other condition? Did the act, by which the bargain was sanctioned (33 Geo. III. chap. 52), leave it to the East India Company to say when they had a surplus and when not? Did it, in short, give them the power of refusing to fulfil this part of the bargain whenever they pleased? Were not the possible causes of inability to pay clearly pointed out by that act? And was there not also a mode, a regular mode of representing the cause of the inability to parliament, duly provided for? J. S. W. has thought proper to pass over all this; but, does he think that I, whose object it is to obtain justice for the burdened people, and myself among the rest, have passed it over? Upon certain conditions the Company were to be indulged with a postponement of the annual demand upon them: these conditions, amongst others, were, the occurrence of *unavoidable* wars and expences, and the regularly representing, to parliament, through the ministers, the state of inability, and also the causes of it. Have these conditions been complied with? Have the ministers, from the passing of the act to this present day, communicated any such representations to the parliament? Have the Company ever made any such representations to the ministers? J. S. W. if he be not much, yea very much indeed, more ignorant than the person, to whom he has thought proper to impute error, knows that they have not; and, he must, of course, know, that the Company is not, and never has been, either in law or equity, entitled to one moment's postponement of the half million a year, and that they are, to all intents and purposes, *indebted* to the nation in the above-said amount.—The Company, by their representatives, the Directors, will tell us, that they disapproved of the wars; that they disapproved of the enormously expensive

establishments in India; that *they* never authorised the expending of more than a quarter of a million upon a palace for the late Governor General; that *they* never authorised the disbursement of the great sums thrown away upon the wild project of an Indian college; and, in short, that *they* disapproved, and expressed their disapprobation, of *all* the measures, civil as well as military, by which their inability to make good their bargain was produced. But, did they, agreeably to the law, make a representation of their inability, to parliament, through the ministry? No: they kept the state of their affairs a profound secret between the ministry of the day and themselves; by which means they prevented the parliament and the nation from discovering the evil in time, and from putting a stop to it. And, shall they *now*, now that it is too late to remedy it; shall they now come to us for an exemption from the debt which they owe us; a debt, which exists only because they kept the causes of their inability to pay from the sight of those, to whom, by law, they were bound to state them, in order to be entitled to any indulgence on their account? J. S. W. seems, though with superabundant caution, to admit, that there may have been transactions, among the Company and their servants, sufficient to destroy the plea of *unavoidable* inability; but, one would gather from the whole of his letter, that he would have us give them money *first*, and enquire into the cause of their poverty *afterwards*. I am for a precisely opposite mode of proceeding; and, beseeching J. S. W. to lay aside, for a little, his Leadenhall-Street jargon about assets and investments, I beg him to give me a plain answer to this plain question: does he think, that the East India Company are exonerated from the demands which the nation had upon them, in consequence of the act of the 33rd Geo. III. chapter 52nd? Leaving him to answer this question, I shall proceed to state what has, since my last number, occurred, relative to the affairs of India.—Mr. Paull has given notice of a motion for further papers, which motion will have been made previous to the appearance of this present number. Mr. Hudleston has (on Tuesday the 15th inst.) said, in his place in the House of Commons, that the paper (the dispatch above spoken of), for the production of which he had intended to move, having been produced in another place (the India House), so as fully to answer the purpose intended, his motion for that paper was no longer necessary. Mr. Paull has given notice, that, on Tuesday next, the 22d instant, he shall bring forward the *first charge*, which it is his intention to



prefer against Lord Wellesley. And, Lord Archibald Hamilton has given notice, that, on Monday next, the 21st instant, he shall move for certain papers, relative to the conduct of that nobleman.—An interest has, at last, been excited! The nation, so long deaf, has opened its ears: it has opened its eyes after such long and such obstinate blindness: after such a tedious night of worse than idiot-stupidity, it is fast coming to its senses. Neither the speeches of Sir T. Metcalfe, with all his profundity; nor the *dinner-mongers*, with all their boasted wines and delicacies, have been able any longer to continue the delusion. The demands of millions, dropping in one after another, and to be raised by a tax upon the income of the people, begin to make that same people think. Yes, they really do begin to think, that there is something not quite right in India. They begin to think, that, after all, honesty, abroad as well as at home, is the best policy. Good, considerate, humane; oh, conscientious people! Yes, they really begin to *feel* for the Nabob of Arcot and for the other poor princes of India! I, for one, told them what these Indian victories would end in; but, Mr. Francis has been for twenty-two years repeating the lesson to them. Strange, that such a good, humane, Magdalen-building, Philanthropic-Society, soup-shop, negro-loving people should never have felt for the princes of India till this moment; and that, too, mark me, at the very hour that they are, *very quietly*, receiving, as a boon from the hands of their king, a million of money taken in the Spanish frigates previous to the war. Wonderful morality! But, after all, *they do feel*; and that is good. They feel, that, finally, they have to pay for all these fine Indian conquests, about which so many stupid songs and poems have been made, and inserted in those records of stupidity, the London magazines. Let them feel; and let us hope, that they, and that all the world will profit from their feeling. J. S. W. may strive to justify the East India Company and all their servants. He may bring us some very good arguments in defence of transactions such as those in the Carnatic and at Oude; but, unless he can, some how or other, lessen the additions which those transactions are making, and will still make, to the Income Tax, he may be assured, that his palliatives will all prove useless. The people, the Philanthropic-Society nation, have, hitherto, regarded the fortunes of the English and Scotch nabobs as arising from the plunder of foreigners; but, now they begin to perceive, that they themselves are the plundered party; and, that the famous

India wars are the mere channel through which the wealth, arising from the labour of Britons, finds its way into the pockets of the said Nabobs. They used to think the East India Company another name for immeasurable mines of gold: they now find this Company of Kings upon the "*trink of beggary*:" so poor as to be compelled to come and ask for aid out of the Income Tax; and yet, strange to tell, they see, that all the officers of the Company, civil and military; all the Directors; all, in short, who have any thing to do with this *poor* Company, rolling in wealth! This the people do, at last, begin to perceive; and, I venture to assure J. S. W. that he will not be able again to close their eyes, unless he can put a stop to the applications for parliamentary aid.—Mr. Paull's intention to bring on his *charges* is very proper, and very prudent. That he will nought *extenuate*, I do hope; and, certainly he will have no temptation to set down aught in malice. These charges, once upon the table of the House of Commons, and, of course, before the public, we shall all see what is the extent of them. The thing will be under our eyes in a regular, a compact, and in somewhat of a legal form. There will be the means of entering upon the consideration of the several parts of the subject one at a time. The parliament and the nation will soon come to something like a settled opinion upon certain points at least; because, assuredly, the charges will not come forth unaccompanied with what can be said in the way of defence.—To say that I wish Mr. Paull success would be to express a wish hostile to the person against whom his charges are to be made; but, I wish to see him ably and *heartily* supported, and I shall be most deeply grieved, if I do not see the Fox part of the ministry at the head of his supporters. Mr. Francis's support he will certainly have; and, indeed, it were to libel the House of Commons to suppose, that such a cause should go a begging for support. Nevertheless, if there were not a second voice, one is enough. Let the *charges* be produced; let us see the proofs; let us hear what is said on the other side; and, then, I'll warrant that we come to a decision that all the power in the world shall never efface from our minds.—Before quitting the Affairs of India, it is necessary to notice a debate that took place, in the House of Commons, on Wednesday the 16th, first giving a little farther explanation, as to the motion, of which Lord Archibald Hamilton has given notice, and which is to be made on Monday next. This motion is for the production of the paper, the very important paper, which Mr. Hudleston,



after repeated notices, declined to move for, *because it had been produced elsewhere!* This reason did not appear satisfactory to his lordship, and, therefore, in a manner becoming his rank and character, he instantly gave notice of his intention to move for it. I have before congratulated the public upon the appearance of several young and independent politicians; and, amongst them, Lord Archibald Hamilton occupies a distinguished place. His brother, the Marquis of Douglas, acted a most excellent part upon the question of a monument to the memory of Mr. Pitt; and, blind indeed must such men be, if they do not perceive, that *this* is the road to valuable renown. They have seen enough of the miserable fruits of intrigue and of mere party politics. They have seen the pursuers in that chase hunt one another down. They have seen them, each in his turn, shouting victory; and, each in his turn, defeated and disgraced. They have, though their life has not yet been very long, seen enough, and more than enough, to convince them, that an abandonment of principle leads to dishonour in public, and to remorse and anguish in private, as surely as time leads to the grave. This lesson the world has, indeed, at all times, been taught; but, never, perhaps, in accents so persuasive as at *present*; and, let us hope, that the effect will be, in some cases at least, proportioned to the means.—The debate of Wednesday was upon a motion of Mr. FRANCIS, relative to a bill, just brought in by Mr. Hobhouse, respecting the payment of creditors, or pretended creditors, of the Nabob of Arcot. The reader will remember, that this Nabob was one of the unfortunate princes, with whom Lord Wellesley had to do. He will also remember, that the cause of this prince was espoused by Mr. Sheridan, who, so early as 1802, moved for a great quantity of papers, whereon to proceed to an inquiry into that affair. These papers were printed; they have, for more than two years, been before the House of Commons; and yet no motion relating to them has been made by that gentleman. This was what Mr. Francis alluded to when he said, that “it was his misfortune to act almost alone upon those subjects hitherto. Nevertheless, he would still venture to hope for the aid of some gentlemen who, upon the former investigation of India affairs, had acquired some celebrity by their exertions on that occasion, and several of whom were still members of this house. If it were orderly, he would now call on them by name; but he hoped, however, to designate them so, as without any violation of parliamentary order, to arrest their at-

tention, and induce, if possible, their attention and aid in the discussion of Wednesday next. One of them was an hon. member for Norwich; another was a right hon. friend of his, conspicuous for the brilliancy of his eloquence on a former celebrated subject. In regretting the absence of that right hon. gent. he was conscious that he only expressed the common feeling of that house, which he had not of late illumined by the light of his countenance. He hoped the right hon. gent. had not passed into *infinite space*, never to return to that house again; for he had the highest opinion of his character, his spirit, and integrity, and trusted he would be induced to accept this his earnest invitation, to attend once more in his place on Wednesday, and take part in a discussion which he was so competent to elucidate by his knowledge, and enliven by the vivid splendour of his eloquence.”—It is proper to say, however, that, if I am rightly informed, it was, without this summons, Mr. Sheridan’s resolution to attend upon all questions relating to the Nabob of Arcot. That he will attend, and will do justice to the subject, I, for my own part, have little doubt; and, having been confidently assured, that this was his resolution *before* the speech of Mr. Francis was made, I have thought it quite proper to state the substance of my information.

**MILITARY AFFAIRS.**—In the preceding sheet, p. 513 and the following ones, some remarks were offered upon the new military measures proposed to be adopted. In the same page reference was made to all the several articles, which, upon the subject of the army, had appeared in the present Volume of this work. Pages 534 and 538 contained two other letters, which may be considered as making part of the discussion; and, in the present Number will be found, 1. A letter, signed PUBLIUS, in commendation of the plan of Brigadier General Stewart, which was noticed in a previous sheet, and of which Publius has not been able to induce me to change my opinion. And, 2. A letter from “A COUNTRY-GENTLEMAN AND A VOLUNTEER OFFICER,” commenting upon what was said by me, in page 520, upon that part of Mr. Windham’s measure which relates more particularly to the *Volunteer officers and corps*. Upon this last letter, as a sort of defence of the Volunteer establishment, and as coming very opportunely to be illustrated by the *present* conduct of some, at least, of the Volunteer corps, I propose to make a few remarks, begging the reader first to turn to the letter itself; and, after these remarks, there is



word or two to be said about the *Germans*, who have been brought into this country, in such numbers, and, if I am well informed, with an intention of *keeping them here!*—The Volunteer officer sets out with a complaint against *the language*, in which I speak (particularly in page 520) of the Volunteer officers and corps, and also of the inspecting field officers. If he means to speak as a critic, my answer is, that, in words themselves there is nothing improper, unless they are offensive to the ear of unaffected modesty; not that sort of modesty, whence a harlot is induced to give the term of *small-cloaths* to breeches, but real modesty; and, I do trust, that, in the words which "the country gentleman" complains of, there is nothing offensive thereunto. Then, as to the application of words, the rule certainly is, that the phrase should be suited to the subject; and, thinking as I do of the Volunteer establishment, and of the particular persons to whom I was pointing, it would have become me to use, if I could have found them, phrases still lower than those which I did use. It has always been accounted an excellence in language, that it affords a choice of synonymous terms; and the reason is, not because you are thereby enabled to avoid a monotony of sound; for that is an object of very inferior importance; but, because you are enabled to suit your phrase to the subject upon which you are writing or speaking; though, it must be evident enough, that, if complaints like that of my correspondent were to be listened to, all the advantages, or, at least, the principal advantage, of synonymous terms would cease.—But, it is the facts with which we have chiefly to do; and first, with respect to "toad-eaters." This is a very good phrase; it means men, who deal in gross and fulsome adulation, at the same time that they, from the bottom of their souls, despise the objects of it. I have never said that *all* the inspecting field-officers were persons of this description; I do not know that I am personally acquainted with any one of them; but, of many, and of many persons in much higher rank too, have I read the speeches and other fulsome effusions in the newspapers, and, of all these effusions do I pronounce the authors to be toad-eaters; and toad-eaters, too, of the most despicable kind; for what can be so despicable, as to see men of exalted rank or of an exalted profession, *abandoning their own superiority together with the superiority of their profession*, in order to gain the applause (and, in all appearance, with a view to emolument to be therefrom derived) of those to instruct and command whom they are especially appointed? In Col. Sharpe, I

am glad to see exhibited an instance of the contrary; but, I do think, that my correspondent ought not to have expected me to insert what he has, so much in detail said upon this gentleman's conduct, especially as I had mentioned no names, and had alluded to nothing but what had appeared in print.—That the Volunteers, with whom this correspondent is particularly acquainted, may not have possessed the means "to congregate, to toast, and to guttle," I can readily believe; but, what else has there, for years, been going on amongst the Volunteers in and about London? Since the establishment of these corps, in 1803, when has there a week passed without the appearance of column upon column, in the newspapers, filled with accounts of the breakfasts, the dinners, the collations; the meats and the liquors; the gasconading toasts and songs; the empty, the stupid speeches, and the more stupid letters, of these Volunteer corps and their officers? Are all these forgotten, does my correspondent think? Or, did he never hear of them? Did he never hear of Colonel Pitt, while a hired singer was bawling forth the praises of the Volunteers from the lower end of the table, toasting "the Volunteers of Great Britain, and a speedy meeting with Buonaparté on our own shores?" Where has my correspondent been, that he has never heard of that he has never felt disgust approaching to nausea, at these things?—"In the country it has not been so." And who ever said it was? And, here I must complain of unfairness on the part of my correspondent; for, how could he suppose, that I meant, that noblemen and gentlemen, would run the risk of sitting down to table, in *Suffolk*, along with hair-dressers and turtle-soup makers? I have, too, as my readers will bear testimony, constantly said, that the Volunteers in country places and particularly such yeomanry as my correspondent describes, were likely to be of some use, if not brought into bodies too large, and if kept away from the caballing battalions of great towns. I have also frequently, in answer to the base misrepresentations of the Addington writers, said, that, as to many of the Volunteers, I thought they had entered upon the service with the best possible motives. I am not bound to repeat these exceptions every time I write upon the subject; and it is unfair in the extreme to argue as if the exceptions had never been made. How often has it been observed, that almost every man I am acquainted with is, in some way or other, a Volunteer? And, as to Mr. Windham, whom the volunteer writers have chosen to consider as the personal enemy of every man who belongs to the establishment, it is well



known, that he is a Volunteer colonel, or major, or something of that sort, and that he was, as such presented at court! Is it not, then, extremely unfair to argue as if we, who disapprove of the Volunteer system, were the enemies of the men who belong to those corps?—"Why do you thank God, that the Volunteers are to be disbanded?" And, might I not say, why do you ask me that question? Me, whom you have heard give my reasons, over and over again, even to the wearying of the public, for wishing this measure to be adopted? After having so often stated one's reasons in support of a proposition, it is too hard to be asked, in one short dry sentence, *why* we make the proposition? But, amongst many other reasons that I have given, one was, that the Volunteer corps were not to be *relied* upon in time of real urgency; that, upon the near prospect of real hard duty, they might disband themselves; that they might, at any moment, do this from mere caprice; and, more than once, I have begged the advocates of the system to consider, that these corps were *deliberative* bodies, that they would, if suffered to remain, canvass the measures of the King and of the parliament, and that, they might so connect themselves by correspondencies, or otherwise, as to over-rule the decisions of the parliament, or, at least, to influence those decisions. Whether this reason was a sound one, or not, we may now be better able to judge from the conduct of the Volunteer corps in Southwark, of whose proceedings, in consequence of Mr. Windham's speech in the House of Commons, the following proclamation will convey sufficient intelligence. "*Orderly Room, Castle Street, Southwark, April 11, 1806.*" "Mr. Secretary Windham having officially disapproved of the Volunteer system as it now stands, and *proposed new arrangements of military defence inconsistent with the present establishment of the corps*, the military committee hereby inform the members they have deemed it proper to *disband it*: to effectuate which, the privates, forming part of the committee, have, in their own names, and in the names of the rest, delivered in their resignations as members of the 'St. Saviour's, Southwark, Volunteer Infantry,' to the commanding officer; and the officers have resigned their commissions into the hands of the Vice-Lord Lieutenant, that they may not militate against any new arrangements of the government."

—There needs no comment upon this. Its insolence is equal to its stupidity, and the latter is equal to the former. These, observe, are amongst our "gallant defenders,"

who were thanked, in anticipation, by the senators at Westminster; and, they are, too, amongst those very corps, those *selected* heroes, who, being upon a trip to Epsom Downs, actually voted *the erection of a monument* there, to perpetuate the memory of their deeds! I am a Surrey man; my county shall not, if I can help it, be disgraced by such a monument; and, should it be erected, I will most assuredly purchase some trifling copyhold cottage in the manor, in order to possess the legal right of throwing it down, as an encroachment upon the common; for, if its foundation rob but one single sheep of one single hour's feed in a year, nay, if it rob, only once in seven years, a rabbit of its supper, who will say that its cost is not far beyond the worth of the object purchased?—We are told, that this is a single instance of refractory behaviour. We have seen scores of such instances. But, at *present*, it may be a single instance; and let us hope that it will; though, I must confess, that the hopes which the Morning Chronicle entertains, from the tranquilising circular letter of Col. ALCOCK, has not much weight with me, especially when I consider, that the said colonel is a *clerk in the Treasury*, or something of that sort; treasurer of the county, I believe, supported by his relation at Whitehall. For the obedience of this colonel, as well as for that of the whole corps at Somerset-House, the ministry of the day have always a good security; but, for that of the volunteer corps in general, they have none at all; and, blind indeed must be the man, who is not now convinced of the extreme danger of relying for the defence of the country upon means so very precarious. If, merely to mention the volunteer system with disapprobation; if the war minister's merely intimating his intention to propose *new arrangements* with regard to it; if, merely upon this, the volunteer corps, or any one of them, disband themselves, what security can you have for their obedience to the commands of the government, in case of actual necessity? Every man who reflected, saw, that when the moment came to call upon those corps for real service; for marching to a great distance from their homes and their business; for the sustaining of considerable losses; for the enduring of great bodily fatigue, accompanied with all sorts of privations; every reflecting man saw, that, at such a time, there would be great danger of experiencing a refractory behaviour, and that, when the pinch came, something or other would be found out, or invented, as a ground of quarrel with the government. But, *now*, I think, that no re-



flection is required upon the subject. We have the verification of the fact before our eyes; and I do hope that the parliament will profit from this timely experience, by putting an end to the establishment altogether, and, if the drilling scheme is to be persevered in, to make *no exceptions* in behalf of the volunteer corps, who, they may be assured, will be continually finding out some pretext or other whereon to ground a justification of disobedience to the commands of the government. As to the yeomanry, there might be some exception; but, short of a plan something like that of Major Cartwright's, I do not clearly see how any exception can very well be made. A *regular army*, and a *people armed and trained*; these are what we want, and we want nothing else: assuredly we do not want men assembled in corps, the officers having military rank, and the whole corps having the power of disbanding themselves at any moment that they please. Call you this military service? Service having rank and pay, but secured by no bond, and subject to no command! "Such service," if one may, without risking the charge of levity, quote the description, "is, indeed, *perfect freedom*." —I am by no means inclined to deny, that my correspondent, as well as many thousands of others, have put themselves to great expense, and have undergone considerable fatigue, on account of their being in volunteer corps. I can sympathize with a man, who has "endured all the rigours of the season, during frequent field-days, in the month of December, upon ground lying very high, and without a tree to afford him shelter; and that, too, after having ridden 9 or 18 miles, in order to get to the scene of action;" but, I can, partake, too, in idea, of the smiling fire-side at his return; of the table well covered; of the liquors waiting for his selection, while the servants, after taking off his boots and bringing his slippers, are gone to attend to his horse; and, I do know, that this horse has a much better house and a much better bed than a real soldier can expect at the end of a day's marching or a day's fighting. — But, the *expense*! And, here, I must make a serious complaint against my correspondent. He reproaches me with speaking contemptuously of the volunteer system, seeing what great expenses the volunteers have put themselves to. Now, I throw myself upon the justice of my readers, I ask them, whether I have not constantly represented these expenses (which I always regarded as inseparable from the establishment) as one of the great evils of the volunteer system? Whether I have not, all along

complained against these expenses? And, whether my correspondent is not here fully confirming the statement of Mr. Windham, who, in opening his plan, said that the private expense was equal to the public expense of the establishment, and who was so positively and so boisterously contradicted by the still remaining adherents of the system? — I said, in page 521, "We have seen their (the volunteers) bullying advertisements too long. We have too long endured their insolence, and their violations of the law." Of these my correspondent says, *he has seen, and heard, nothing*; whereupon one might ask him, in what snug corner of this island he has been living for these three years last past? For, is there in any place, whereunto men resort, and where they come at a sight of the ordinary vehicles of information; is there any such place, where these things have not been heard of? And, seriously speaking, will my correspondent say, that he has never heard of the bold attempts at assessing and raising money upon the people by the committees of volunteer corps, not unaccompanied with *threats* against those who should refuse to submit to their precepts; that he has never heard of the riot at Chester, of the breaking open of the jail there, and of the setting of the prisoners at liberty; that he has never heard of the firing upon the King's officers and sailors engaged in apprehending marine deserters at Mounts Bay; that he has never heard of a volunteer, who, being jeered by a neighbour on account of his soldiering, clubbed his musket, knocked down the jester, and killed him, was afterwards set free by a verdict of manslaughter? Will my correspondent seriously say, that he has never heard of any of these, or of the scores (I might say hundreds) of other instances of insolence and violation of the law, of which the volunteers have been guilty? And, I ask him this question: what does he think would be the sentence upon a soldier of the regular army, who should club his musket and kill an inhabitant of Ipswich for laughing at him? Let him, first well reflecting upon what he says, answer me that question; and, such reflection may probably enable him to find a reason, without going any further, for my thanking God, that there is a prospect that the volunteers shall be disbanded. — There remains but one part of my correspondent's letter whereon to remark; and that is the part where he has recourse to the old argument of experience, drawn from the example afforded by the history of the French army, during, and since, the revolution in that country. His words are these: "I am at a loss to know, why you attack



“Colonel BIRCH. We have seen many men, during the French revolution, rise to the highest commands, whose former avocations were as little military as the rolling of puffs or the seasoning of soups.” —And, here, I have a two-fold ground of complaint against my correspondent: first, that he has neglected that which is an essential duty with any one who has recourse to an argument of experience, to wit, the *proof of the facts*, whereon such argument is founded. If the facts be of perfect notoriety, or, if they be admitted by the adversary, then the proof may be dispensed with; but, if you have neither of those to proceed upon, your argument has no logical foundation, and may, therefore, be passed over in silence, without at all impairing the cause of your opponent. Next, I have to complain, that my correspondent, re-urges this argument (admitting it to have a foundation in fact) without any attempt at a refutation of the arguments used, and, I think, successfully used against it. This *example* afforded by the history of the French revolution has been, over and over again, shown to be no example at all, as applicable to the volunteer system of England; and, before it was again seriously brought forward, some attempt, at the very least, should have been made to prove, that it was an example in point. —I will not, however, avail myself of these omissions, but will once more give an answer to this argument drawn from the experience of the French revolution; first observing, that, as to Colonel Birch, I have not *attacked* him at all. I have said no evil of him. I have imputed no blame to him. I have rather spoken well of him; and, which cannot be an object beneath the Colonel’s consideration, I have bestowed, by implication at least, high praises upon those tarts and that soup, which form, after all, the most interesting object of his attention. —The men, who, from low life, have, since the commencement of the French revolution, risen to high commands in the army, were, chiefly, soldiers in the regular army previous to the revolution. Those of them, who entered the army since the commencement of the revolution, fought, previous to their promotion, through several arduous and sanguinary campaigns. They, before they became officers, out-fought hundreds, and out-lived thousands upon thousands, of their comrades in arms. The school, in which they acquired their qualifications for command, was, the camp, and the field of battle; they fought their way upward to their reward, aided by physical endowments that enabled them to survive every thing hostile

to life. —Is this not so? Is this not notoriously true? And, if it be, it remains with my correspondent to shew, what feature of *similarity* there is between these men and our volunteer officers. True, that, *formerly*, their avocations might be as “little military as the rolling of puffs or the seasoning of soups.” This *might* be the case, in some few instances; nay, for argument’s sake (though the thing is quite improbable), let us admit, that they were all of them *formerly* as very pastry-cooks as Colonel Birch himself; yet, they are not *now* pastry-cooks; they have not followed the trade since they have had commands in the army; whereas Colonel Birch is a pastry-cook *still*. Nay, and lest it should be said that this Colonel has as good a claim to rank as any Colonel of our regular army who has not fought his way upwards, this Colonel does not submit to *military law*; his commission may, indeed, be taken away, but, can he be ruined; can his bread be taken away; can he be sent a wandering upon the earth; can he be put to death, for a refusal to obey the orders of the king, who has been advised to give him that commission? Is he liable to be sent abroad; is his time no longer his own; can he no longer choose his place of abode; has he, in short, subjected himself to any portion of that absolute controul, to which every officer of the regular army does, and must, subject himself? No: he has, in the eyes of the vulgar at least, *all the honour* attached to military rank, without any portion of its *responsibility*; and, to rank, thus bestowed, where is the man of a just mind who is not hostile? And, where is there such a man, who, feeling it his duty to express such hostility, will hesitate to set at defiance the mis-representations of those who are mean enough to seek for popularity in flattering the prejudices and the passions of the ignorant and the vain?

CHURCH AFFAIRS.—CURATES.—ROYAL CHAPLAINS.—Mr. Perceval, the late Attorney General, has moved for leave to bring in a bill respecting a provision for such stipendiary *Curates* as may reside in the parishes, committed to their charge. The bill is, it appears, the same, in substance, as that which, having the same object in view, was, by Mr. Perceval, brought in last year. —For a description of this bill, see Register Vol. VII. page 788; and, the same place together with page 809, may be referred to for some of the reasons, whereon I was, as I still am, of opinion, that the bill ought to become a law, unless a bill more extensive in its effects, as to the object in view, should be brought in in its





stead.—I have not, at present, room to say much upon this subject; but, convinced as I am, that if some remedy, and that a speedy and effectual one, be not found out and adopted, for the evils of non-residence, the reformed Church of this country, must, at no distant day, undergo another sweeping reformation; thus convinced, I cannot, even here, refrain from endeavouring to call the attention of my readers to the subject of non-residence, with which the bill in question is closely connected.—In the present volume, page 422, will be found a letter to Mr. Windham, complaining of the “severity” of the act, passed under the auspices of Sir William Scott, and by which act the non-residence act of Henry VIII. was repealed. An answer to that letter will be found in the present Number, at page 593; and, I earnestly beseech the reader to peruse both these letters. For my own part, I am decidedly of opinion with the answerer, to whom I beg leave to present my thanks; and, I am persuaded he will receive, as far as the knowledge of his performance shall reach, the thanks of every true friend of the Church, which character, I am sorry to say it, is often considered as being something different from that of a friend of the Clergy.—As a friend of both, I am now about to mention what has occurred at St. James’s relative to the *Chaplains of the King*.—For a great number of years; perhaps, for more than a century; and, as far as I know, ever since the Reformation, there has been, at St. James’s, an establishment of Chaplains. The number of them is 48; four are appointed for each month in the year; and, of these four, two are always *in waiting*. For these there has been a *table* kept, and moderately supplied daily from a kitchen, the expenses of which have been defrayed out of the annual allowance made to His Majesty. But, within these few months, this table, which served as a daily resort for a friend or two of the Chaplains in waiting, and which was one of the things that gave an air of dignity and munificence to the establishment, has been suppressed, the Chaplains being now allowed a stipend of 30*l.* a year each in its stead; and the Chaplains, who are now obliged to get their dinners at a tavern or hotel, are not allowed a room in the palace, even for the purpose of putting on their gowns, though they have made a pressing application for it! The service at this table was in plate, which had grown together from the donations of the King’s Chaplains, who had, successively, gone off by preference. Upon the breaking up of the table, it became a question what should be

done with this plate. A proposition has been made to the Chaplains to sell it for the benefit of some institution connected with the Church; but, some of them have, and very justly, objected to such a measure; contending, that to the donors, or to their descendants, it legally reverts; and, that there is no one upon earth who has a right of giving it away. At the very moment that I am writing, this plate, once amongst the ornaments of the King’s Palace, is lying at a silversmith’s shop, waiting for the hammer or the melting-pot!—Who has advised a measure like this; who, at a time when addition upon addition is made to the Civil List; when addition upon addition is made to the allowances of every branch of the Royal Family; who, under such circumstances, has advised the adoption of a measure like this, for the sake of saving (supposing a saving to take place) about *two thousand pounds a year*, I shall not presume to say; but, that such advice has been given I must express my regret. Very large indeed is the sum annually paid by the people on account of the Civil List. I do not think they grudge it. But, it is in the nature of man to desire, that, about the person, to whom he possesses allegiance, every thing should wear the appearance of greatness. A sensible and generous people will never repine at parting from that which is necessary to support the appearance due to the high office of their sovereign; but, when they make, and with propriety make, large grants to him out of the fruit of their labour, they naturally, and I will add justly, expect to witness external marks of dignity and of splendour proportioned to the magnitude of those grants. If retrenchment had been necessary in the expenses of His Majesty, the establishments, the very scanty establishments, in his Palace; in the Palace, by way of eminence; in the Palace of his ancestors; in the Palace of which his court takes the name; those establishments should, I think, have been the last objects, whereon to lay the hand of parsimony; and, of these establishments, the very last should certainly have been the modest, the strictly economical, establishment in question; for the breaking up of which the only consolation that I have heard suggested, is that, from the source whence the Chaplains’ table used to be supplied, a supply is afforded to the Duke of Clarence and his family, who now reside in the Palace of St. James.—Returning again, for one moment, to the Clergy, I submit to them, whether the want of zeal, the want of public spirit, the want of patriotism, but too clearly evinced in the endless list of non-re-



sident incumbents, in the neglect of the parishes, and in the decided preference, which, in consequence thereof, the common people give to sectarian preachers; I submit to them whether the *general feeling*, excited by this deficiency, on the part of the Clergy, may not, at least amongst other causes, have produced the measure of which I have been speaking. The Clergy (be it remembered that I speak only of *some*, only of what too often appears) seem to rely, not so much upon the good opinion of the people, as upon their selfishness, whereon they ground a degree of confidence proportioned to the general calamities, which they know must be inseparable from any material change as to their establishment and their rights. But, let the man, whom, particularly, I have in my eye; who is the rector of four parishes moulded into two; who is besides a Prebend of a Cathedral Church; who, while he hires curates, at a pitiful stipend, to read prayers and to preach in the parishes of which he receives the large revenues, generously takes upon him the offices of a justice of the peace and a commissioner of taxes: let this man, and let all men like him, reflect, if, indeed, they have the capacity of reflecting, that with nations, as well as with individuals, resentment frequently overpowers all considerations of self-interest. Or, if he, and other men, other bodies of men, other branches of authority, turn with contempt from my warnings, let them, and I conjure them to do it, listen to him, who, in these latter days, has so clearly predicted all that has come to pass. "From passive submission is it (the established order of things) to expect resolute defence? No! It must have warm advocates and passionate defenders, which a heavy, discontented acquiescence never can produce. What a base and foolish thing is it for any consolidated body of authority to say, or to act as if it said, 'I will put my trust, not in my own virtue, but in your patience; I will indulge in effeminacy, in indolence, in corruption; I will give way to all my perverse and vicious humours, because *you cannot punish me without the hazard of ruining yourselves.*'" This Mr. BURKE calls base and foolish. He had seen the consequences of it in France, and, it was amongst the very last of his efforts to warn the established authorities of his own country against it.—Desultory as this article has already become, I cannot quit it without observing, that, from one end of England to the other, there prevails a grudging to render unto the Church its lawful dues; and, this grudging, as in former times, is, I am fully convinced, to be chiefly

attributed to the non-residence of the beneficed Clergy. In speaking of the Reformation, in the reign of Henry VIII. we are all, and particularly the Clergy, too apt to overlook the main cause of it. We have been taught, and it is, from that teaching become habitual amongst us, to attribute the reformation to the *false doctrines* of the Church of Rome; but, if we appeal to authentic history; if we appeal to the laws, by which that Church was destroyed in our country; if we make this appeal, we shall find, that the principal, and I might say, the sole efficient cause, was the gross, the scandalous abuses of *non-residence*, on the part of those who received the revenues of the Church. Now, indeed, these abuses are not so gross; they are not so scandalous; but, let it be recollected, that, as to mental capacity, the people are not now what they then were. It is quite lamentable, and yet somewhat amusing, to hear the Roman Catholics ascribe the fall of their Church, in this country, solely to the libidinous disposition of Henry VIII.; while the Protestants, on their side, ascribe it as exclusively, to the doctrinal errors of that Church, to the worshipping of images, to the dispensing of indulgences, and to the pious frauds of the clergy. They seem, really to have come to an agreement, never to advert to the true, the grand cause; that which rendered the people eager to second all the views of their king hostile to the Church; to wit; the *impious* frauds of a state of things, which gave the hire to those who did *not* labour; which, took the hire, and, in many instances, gave no labour at all, from any hand whatever; which, while it never relaxed in its exactions of dues, suffered, in many places, the houses of God to become heaps of ruins, and left the people without the knowledge of God in the world. Yet, read the acts of parliament, by which the Church of Rome was destroyed, in England, and you will, from the first line to the last of them, find, that this was the great cause; and that, had it not been for this cause, King Henry would never have thought of those measures, which, as we all know, he so easily carried into effect, in defiance of a power which had been firmly established in England for more than seven centuries. Upon these things I once more beseech the reader seriously to reflect; and, I am persuaded, that, as the result of such reflection, he will, as I do, heartily wish success to the endeavours which Mr. Perceval is making to check, before it be too late, the progress of the *present* abuses in the Church. The bill, which he has brought in, goes not far; not nearly far enough. Its utmost ex-



tent, is to obtain, in some instances, a resident curate, in places where, at present, there is *no resident minister at all*. Is it possible, that any man can object to such a bill, unless he be ready to say, that no minister is, in any case, of any use? And, then, we might ask him, upon what ground he will maintain the justice of any longer demanding the dues of the Church? This would be a question of fearful importance; and, I do hope, that the wisdom of the government; that a due sense of their sacred *trust* (for it is no more), in the proprietors of advowsons; and, above all, that a conformity, in spirit and in truth, to their solemn engagements, in the Clergy themselves, will prevent the necessity of its discussion.

MR. FORDYCE.—This gentleman was, as is generally known, for a considerable number of years, Collector General for Scotland. It is also generally known, that, in that capacity, he became a defaulter to the amount of about 100,000*l*. It is, moreover, matter of general notoriety, that this defalcation has not been, in whole, at least, made good; and, that, in consequence of this his situation relative to the public, a motion was, by Mr. Creevy, made, during the last session of parliament, having, evidently, for its object, the throwing of blame upon those ministers, who had, just then, appointed Mr. Fordyce to be one of the commissioners, at the head of whom was Sir Charles Middleton (now Lord Barham), for devising the reforms necessary to be introduced into the management of the departments connected with the navy.—The debate will be found in the Parliamentary Debates, Vol. IV. page 48; and, the amount of the defalcation will be found in the Appendix to the same volume, p. xxxv.—Mr. Fox did not support the motion of Mr. Creevy, for which I, for one, greatly blamed him; and, it is because I now think, that his conduct (owing to his own fault however), was ascribed to a wrong cause, that I am now about to give that explanation, which he ought, in justice to himself, to have given, and, for the want of which, he has, by hundreds, I might say by thousands, and by myself amongst others, been thought, and been said, to have favoured Mr. Fordyce, *on account of that gentleman's family connection with the Duchess of Bedford*, and the only justifiable reason for stating which, thus in print, is, that, while it can scarcely render the imputation more generally known than it already is, it affords the only means of effectually counteracting it.—Mr. Fordyce was appointed Receiver General for Scotland in 1766, in which situation he continued till the year

1783; in the course of which time he employed three different agents for the transmission of money to and from the Exchequer.

—I. At the time of his appointment it was made *part of the conditions on which he received his appointment* from Lord Rockingham, that he should *continue to employ Messrs. DOUGLAS and COCKBURN*, the agents employed, in London, by his predecessor; and in this situation they continued to act, until it was discovered that they had retained a sum of above 40,000*l*. in their hands, which had been remitted to be paid over to the Exchequer. Upon discovering this, information was immediately given, by Mr. Fordyce, to the commissioners of taxes, and steps were taken, with their approbation, to secure as much as possible to the public from the effects of those agents. From these effects, so secured, above 27,000*l*. has been recovered, and paid to the Exchequer; and for the balance still due, of about 13,000*l*. there are effects remaining in the hands of Messrs. White and Goodenough, trustees for the Treasury; but it is not expected that they will produce more than 3 or 4,000*l*. For this balance, however, Mr. Fordyce does not consider himself to be personally liable, it having been made, as has been already stated, a *condition of his accepting the office*, that he should continue to employ them as his agents.—

II. A sum of money was voted by parliament for the payment of debts, due by forfeited estates in Scotland, which was directed to pass through Mr. Fordyce's office, and this money, having been paid into the hands of ALEXANDER FORDYCE, of London, (at that time a banker in the very highest credit, and in no wise privately connected with Mr. Fordyce, either by family relationship, or by trade, or by any money transactions whatsoever,) as the agent of Mr. Fordyce, it was gradually drawn for to answer the claims of the creditors on those estates; but Alexander Fordyce failed with a large sum of the money in his hands, and before payment of the greater part of the bills drawn upon him, which, in consequence of his failure, came back upon Mr. Fordyce; and the amount of the money and the bills together, came to nearly 60,000*l*. of which very little was recovered; as he was declared bankrupt before the writ of extent, which was, without the loss of a single hour, applied for by Mr. Fordyce, could be carried into effect; and for the sum lost by him Mr. Fordyce became responsible.—III. The third agent employed by Mr. Fordyce, was the house of FERGUSON and MURDOCH, then of un-



doubted credit; but they also fell into the irregularity of retaining the money remitted to be paid to the Exchequer; and, in the year 1781, it was discovered that they had about 58,000*l.* thereof in their hands. Mr. Fordyce, upon this discovery, made every exertion to get an extent upon their effects, and, with great difficulty, got it accomplished; and the whole was placed under the management of the solicitor of the Treasury (Mr. White), and the secretary of the Board of Taxes (Mr. Goodenough), as trustees for the Treasury. From these effects sums to the amount of about 30,000*l.* have been collected, and paid to the Exchequer and it is expected that from 10 to 15,000*l.* further may be recovered from the remainder thereof, which are still under the management of the same trustees.—The balances remaining due, independent of that of Douglas and Cockburn, which is about 9000*l.* are as follow:

By Ferguson and Murdoch about £28,000  
By Mr. Fordyce himself, in consequence of the losses which have been before-mentioned - - - 13,000

£41,000

For the payment of which, he proposed in a letter to the Treasury, sent at the desire of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, to give the bonds of gentlemen of undoubted fortune and responsibility, and other securities described in that letter, for the discharge of the whole of the remaining balance: for the part remaining due by himself payable in the course of the years 1807 and 1808; and for the part due by Ferguson and Murdoch in the four succeeding years, by equal instalments.—This is the naked state of the case; but, there are some circumstances to be noticed; and, first, that, in neither of the three instances, did the loss arise from any fault, either of commission or of omission, on the part of Mr. Fordyce; for, besides, that the agents (in one instance not of his own choosing) were bankers in the highest credit, it appears that, the moment he suspected danger, he used every exertion in the power of man to prevent its effects; and, which is very material, and which observe, clearly distinguishes him from those which we, in general, denominate *defaulters*, the loss did, in no one instance, arise from his having kept the money in his own hands, or having caused it to be kept in the hands of others, for any purpose of private emolument; but arose from the failure of agents taking place during the time, that the money was passing, through them, between him, and the exchequer; and, in short, that the loss must be considered as purely accidental; as

being a misfortune, which no human foresight could be expected to prevent.—It was so considered by Lord John Cavendish, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1803, when the final failure took place; and, accordingly, that minister, though he thought that there would be an impropriety in continuing to employ Mr. Fordyce as collector, had it in full contemplation to give him some active employment, whereby he might be supported in reputation at the same time that he had the means of living and of endeavouring to make up his defalcation. That ministry ceased; but its intentions with respect to Mr. Fordyce were acted upon by the succeeding ministry; and, it is confidently stated, and, I believe, with perfect truth, that Mr. Fordyce has given all that he has been able to accumulate to the liquidation of his debt to the public, in diminution of which he paid 8,250*l.* being the whole of the sum voted by parliament as one of the Commissioners for examining into, and reporting upon, the state of the woods and forests; and, he long since gave security, by bonds of undoubted sureties, for payments which became due in the months of March, July, and December last, to the amount of 29,500*l.*; so that the balances now remain as above stated.—It was not 'till last Tuesday, that I was furnished with the means of giving this explanation. They were furnished by a friend of Mr. Fordyce; but, they were not, on that account, to be rejected, especially when the use of them was so necessary to the counteracting of an opinion so erroneous, so generally adopted, and so very injurious to the public character of Mr. Fox, who, strange to say, was, at the time of the debate above referred to, in possession of all these same materials, and that, too, from the very same source, of the purity of which he could not possibly entertain a doubt. And, here we have an instance of the effect of that fatal, and universally lamented propensity, of disguising from men in high situations that which it is thought will be disagreeable for them to hear; for, if, amongst the hundreds of the friends of Mr. Fox, one had been bold enough to tell him what I have stated by way of introduction to this article, it is quite impossible, that he should not have found out some means or other of causing this explanation to be given.

#### VOLUNTEERS.

SIR,—“Suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.” I am led to remind you of the former part of this excellent apothegm, which occurred to me on reading your remarks on Mr,



Windham's military plan, many of which are made with that judgment and acuteness, by which you are eminently distinguished; but when you mention the Volunteers, I am sorry to see you indulging in a severity of language, that must be highly displeasing to many of your readers, and cannot, in my opinion, be productive of a better effect than if the same strictures had been conveyed in more moderate terms. I think, Sir, the epithet you bestow on the inspecting field officers, whom you call "a swarm of toad-eaters," very indecorous. You may possibly allude to some persons among them, whose conduct may have provoked you to express yourself so harshly; but I am confident that the majority of those gentlemen, are completely above acting a part, by doing which, they would merit the meanest appellation our language affords. Permit me, at least, to rescue one meritorious officer from your unjust attack, and I have no doubt that several of your readers could produce the names of many individuals of equal probity and honour. The gentleman to whom I have alluded is Lieut. Col. Sharpe, one of the inspecting field officers of the district in which I reside; an officer who has seen much service, and of whose merits many in this garrison (Ipswich) have spoken to me in high terms. I have been several times inspected by him, and am ready to pledge you my word, that at least, on those days, he was no toad-eater; he always took the greatest pains to promote the discipline of the corps (yeomanry cavalry); and found fault with our evolutions whenever necessary, and did so upon several occasions, and only on some days did we meet with his unqualified approbation. I am not in habits of intimacy with the colonel, but merely quote him as having come under my own immediate observation. Why do you thank God that the volunteers are to be disbanded? The greater part of them have never had the means, as you elegantly express yourself, "to congregate, toast, and to guttle;" neither have I seen "their insolence, and their violations of the law." Thousands, and ten-thousands of them, whose conduct has been guided by a patriotic zeal, are entitled to the best thanks of their country. As one among many, I can safely say, that my equipments, and some unlooked for expenses, have nearly cost me 100l. What compensation, in a mercenary point of view, is the exemption from the horse and hair-powder tax? and do you think, Mr. Cobbett, that a married man, enjoying a fortune as I do, perfectly ample for the purposes of a country life, could be tempted to expose himself to all the rigours of the season,

which I experienced during frequent field days, in Dec. 1803 and 1804, the ground being very high, and not a tree to afford shelter nearer than 3 miles; and to be present at which it was necessary to ride 9 miles, and some came 18, merely to wear a red jacket, and to be called a volunteer? I certainly coincide with you, that regular officers should have a superior rank to those belonging to the volunteers, though I see no good reason why a lieut. or ensign of the former, should have the command of the field officers of the latter. I am at a loss to know your motive for attacking Col. Birch; we have seen many men, during the French revolution, rise to the highest commands in their army, whose former avocations were as little military "as the rolling of puffs, and the seasoning of soups." The yeomanry corps are chiefly composed of young farmers, nor are they often commanded by shopkeepers; nor among the infantry volunteers, at least in this county, will a gentleman be in any danger of meeting at a mess table, "the man who in the morning had cut his hair, or sold his wife a wig." I trust, Sir, that with your accustomed impartiality, you will favour me with an early insertion of my letter in your valuable Register, and also pardon me, if I say, that I think it is by no means incompatible with your character, as the faithful sentry and guardian of your country's rights and welfare, that where you find cause for disapprobation, your means of expressing it should not wound the feelings of many of your readers, who are, like your humble servant,—A COUNTRY GENTLEMAN AND VOLUNTEER OFFICER.—*Ipswich, April 14th, 1806.*

#### THE ARMY.

SIR;—At a time when the attention of the country is directed in an eminent degree to the improvement of our military strength, and when a coalition of talent which has rarely been equalled, gives reason to hope for the most desirable result, it may be deemed a species of intrusion for an undistinguished individual to interfere with a subject which is already in such able hands. But as the space I may hope to occupy in your pages cannot be devoted to apologizing, permit me through the medium of your paper, to offer a few remarks on a work whose appearance has excited considerable interest, not more from the importance of the subject, than from the high character of the author, both as a soldier and as an individual.—It will be readily concluded, that I allude to the publication of the Honourable Brigadier General Stewart, on the Reform of the British Land Forces. There are, per-



haps, few men whose services and experience better qualify them for delivering their opinion upon the subject, and few who would have executed the task in a manner more honourable to their professional talents, to their philanthropy, and to their knowledge of mankind. Of the numbers who have written on military discipline, few seem to have pointed out so clearly as the Hon. General, the precise method in which the advantages of discipline are to be produced. Attached to established form and opinions, many have imagined that the manual dexterity communicated to the soldier, and the imposing appearance of vast bodies moving in concert, were the grand advantages arising from military discipline; while the prodigious impression which has been frequently produced by the irregular efforts of enthusiastic valour, on troops in the highest state of mechanical discipline, forms a constant and most puzzling contradiction to their system. But when we are taught to look for the effects of discipline, not so much in the physical as in the moral improvement of the soldier, we are introduced at once to the true source of military excellence. The manual dexterity which is the consequence of discipline, is undoubtedly valuable, and its effects may be made the subject of calculation; but where the effect of discipline is extended beyond the mere animal frame, its powers cease to be calculable, because they can hardly be confined within the ordinary limits of possibility. The heroes of Thermopylae made themselves immortal, not by the numbers who fell beneath their swords, but because their discipline had taught them to die with pleasure, where their country demanded the sacrifice.—The ideas of the hon. author on the importance of raising the military profession in the estimation of the public, and of calling forth those energies in the mind of the soldier, which a regular army alone seems calculated to inspire, on the inefficacy of the volunteer system, and the inadequacy of the militia to produce a force competent to the exigencies of the times, are such as might be expected from his experience and his judgment. That his suggestions on the propriety of restricting the enlistment of the soldier to certain periods, may be quickly realised, must be the wish of every friend to his country and to rational and constitutional liberty. But why does the Hon. General insist, that the rewards to be claimed by the soldier on the termination of his different periods of service, should depend on those services having been *uninterrupted*? On the expiration of any of the periods of service, it is more than probable, that the greater part of the soldiery would

express a desire to return to their friends and homes. And, it is also most probable, that in a few weeks, or at most a few months, by far the greater part of these would be induced by old habits and inaptitude for civil life, to think of returning to their posts in the army. Whoever will suppose himself in the situation of the private soldier, will allow that this would most probably be his own conduct. Why then should men in these circumstances be discouraged from re-entering the army, by the consideration, that by an absence of a few months, they had forfeited all claim to the rewards and honours of their past services; or, why in justice should they be deprived of the recompence due to their service, on account of what in most cases would prove no more than an extended furlough, which it must be natural for every man in such a situation to desire? It may be urged, that if the country is to pay for services, it has a right to expect the best and most profitable years of a man's life. But, of course it is understood, that the services for which a recompence is demanded, shall have been both complete and effective, and that a proper investigation shall take place on them before their merits are allowed. If a man should enlist at such an age, that several of his last years of service must fall on the feeble and ineffective portion of his life, it is evident that he can have no claim to the rewards for full and completed services. The same would be the situation of the man, who by protracting the intervals between his periods of service, should render his latter years unserviceable; and, however harsh the idea may appear of deserting a man who finds old age advancing on him in the service of his country, it cannot be more severe than that of rejecting the claims of him who has completed his whole number of years with honour and with effect, merely because natural feelings or the love of novelty, may have induced him at intervals of six or eight years, to take advantage for a few months of the opportunity which is placed within his reach. Had these considerations occurred to the Hon. General, the liberal and philanthropic spirit diffused throughout his work, leaves no room to suppose that they would not have had their due weight.—On the subject of the purchase of commissions, it may be observed, that whatever is the case in other countries, in our own property has generally been found to be a better criterion of intellectual qualification than any other that can be assigned. The regulations on the subject of members returned to parliament, officers in the militia, and many other descriptions of persons capable of filling or appointing to offices of



trust, appear to acknowledge this principle. The general diffusion of information which engages all our countrymen to go to the extent of their abilities in the attainment of knowledge, may account for this peculiarity. In some countries nobility has been an indispensable requisite for promotion in the army; and this might be politic, if the sentiments and qualifications necessary to the officer, were exclusively confined to the order of nobility. But this is not the case in England, and, therefore, we never hear of such a requisition. A certain period is at present fixed for each rank, before the completion of which, neither interest nor property can effect the officer's promotion to a higher; and this is supposed to be a period competent to the completion of the officer in the duties of his immediate station, and of the next succeeding one. With respect to the first introduction of the officer to the army, the exigencies of the ordinary service of the British army, are not so great as to give much reason for apprehension, on account of the time which must elapse after a subaltern receives his first commission, before he is able to discharge its duties respectably. It is of great importance that officers should be advanced to the higher ranks, before their faculties and vigour decline; our enemies attack us with generals in the flower of their age, and we must do the same if we would oppose them with success. No term, or, at least, no moderate term, which a subaltern could serve before he obtained his commission, would make him equal in some points to an old and experienced serjeant; but the objects of the subaltern's ambition should be of a higher order, and are, perhaps, better acquired by passing a few years in the ordinary intercourse of life, and attainment of knowledge, than in any subordinate station which could be devised in the army. There is something very specious in the idea of examinations preceding the conferment of promotion; but to those who know how liable such institutions are to abuse, and how impossible it is to prevent this from taking place, their value will be considerably diminished. An examination of this nature takes place in the naval service, and though the vigour of the present administration gives reason to augur better things now, the writer well knows, and many who read this will know, that the certificates of service have hitherto been the principal objects of attention, and that a youth who was well recommended, was troubled with few more vexatious questions, than "when did you hear from your uncle the Admiral?" It may indeed, be fairly doubted, whether property is not in this country, as good a title to promo-

tion as interest. Recommendations are often founded on other grounds than the merits of the object; whereas, property in this country always supposes respectability, and generally superiority of information. There may, perhaps, arise advantages to the public service, from the junction of these two roads to promotion, which would not proceed from either of them singly. Few men would feel inclined to devote a great proportion of their fortunes to their promotion in the army, who were not actuated by some desire of distinguishing themselves; and this desire is the best, or, indeed, the only pledge of exertion and success.—That the hon. author has been actuated throughout by the purest motives of regard to the public service, appears from the liberality with which he divests himself of all private interests and connexions, when they appear to him to interfere with the improvements he proposes. But, perhaps, the public will be of opinion, that the zeal of the Hon. General has carried him farther than was necessary, when it led him to sacrifice his feelings as connected with a branch of the service, which, if report says true, is greatly indebted to his abilities and exertions. It is acknowledged that perfection is best attained by the application of individual talents to particular objects; and this principle is allowed in the military, as well as in other arts, in sciences, and in manufactures. It appears to have been acted upon in the formation of the different species of force which compose the British army, into distinct battalions, as is the case with the light infantry and riflemen; from the persuasion, no doubt, that in such circumstances, the abilities and exertions of individual officers will prove more extensively useful; and from the recollection that it is infinitely more easy to divide than to combine. The rifle forms one of the most considerable modern additions to the art of defensive war, and as such is of the highest importance to this country; and if from the peculiar accuracy of which it is capable, or other adventitious circumstances, it affords room for greater skill and greater science than the ordinary weapons of defence; there must be reason to suppose, that this like other branches of the service, will be best promoted by being concentrated, and rendered the peculiar study of a particular class of officers. We might ask the hon. author himself, whether the attention which he has undoubtedly bestowed on the regiment with which he is immediately connected, could have been equally effective if that force had been dispersed in isolated companies, among battalions of light infantry? That there are peculiar features in the service of riflemen



sufficient to entitle them to rank as a peculiar service, is in some degree proved by the eagerness, which according to the accounts of officers acquainted with the circumstance, is manifested by the soldiery for serving in that, in preference to other corps; and even this is an advantage which need not be gratuitously thrown away. There is no difficulty in dividing force when circumstances may require it, but considerable disadvantage in combining troops which have not been accustomed to act in concert. If, therefore, some loss may possibly result from one proceeding, and no disadvantage from the contrary, the public will give the hon. author full credit for the disinterestedness of his intentions; but will not insist on his surrendering the offspring of his talents for the sake of furnishing a name to the company of honour in a battalion of light infantry. Marksmen, chasseurs, or many other titles might be invented, which would produce an equal effect, and might be common to the light infantry and rifle battalions.—You have yourself, Sir, been a British soldier, and will, I am sure, regard with interest every thing which relates to the welfare of the British army. And while an enlightened administration gives to every suggestion on subjects of public importance, the attention which the talents of their authors may demand, you will not refuse your indulgence to the weakest, in consideration of the good intention which directed them.—PUBLIUS.

#### PROPERTY, (OR INCOME) TAX.

[Written, observe, previous to the opening of the New Minister's Budget.]

SIR,—Though distinguished by various modifications, the Property and Income Tax may, respecting its operation and results, be justly considered as being inseparably united.—The principles on which this tax is founded, viz. "That in times of great public exigency every member of the community should contribute in proportion to his ability, and to the stake he has to preserve; exempting, as far as possible, the lower order of the people from additional burdens," are just, wise, and humane.—If income, therefore, were, *in reality*, a fair standard of ability to bear taxation, or could by any modification become such, the Income Tax, so far from being objectionable, would become one of the most eligible and equitable imposts that government could adopt.—But equality of income, derived from sources or causes *totally dissimilar*, cannot be a just standard for equality of contribution. To enumerate the various means by which the subjects of this highly civilized and commercial nation become possessed of

income would be useless, on this occasion, even if it were possible. It is sufficient, therefore, in proof of the above position, to observe, that possessors of income, or property, liable to taxation, may be generally classed under the four following heads: 1st. The proprietor of land, houses, money at interest, in the public funds, or private loans. 2dly. The merchants, wholesale dealer, in any article of trade or necessary of life, shopkeeper, tradesman, mechanic, &c. 3dly. The pensioner, or life annuitant, who is possessed of a certain yearly stipend to the attainment and continuance of which no exertion or trouble is required. 4th. All those who derive their annual income from public or private salaries, wages, or periodical payments, for which public or private duty is required. This last comprehensive and numerous class extends to the highest and the lowest orders of the community; including alike the first minister of state, and the lacquey that rides behind his carriage. They all (supposing them possessed of no *extraneous* property) subsist on a salary, or wages, which ends with their life, and for which they are required to perform adequate service. Thus it is evident, that in the four classes above enumerated, there are four different kinds of income subject to the same indiscriminate and heavy pressure of this boasted *standard of equality*! The following example, selected from thousands, will suffice to prove, beyond the possibility of contradiction, or even of doubt, the injustice, impolicy, and hardship of the Income Tax, in its *present* mode of operation.—A person possessed of 200l. per annum, either in landed estate, or in the funds, is assessed to the Income and Property Tax 5l. per cent. on the *interest* only of his property, which, at his death, descends to his children or his heirs, or legatees. Another, placed in a public or private department, the duty of which demands his *whole time* and attention, and probably may, if serving in the army, put his *life* to hazard in his country's cause, receives a like sum of 200l. per annum, which is his *only property*, which ends with his life, and which, if he has a family, must be very inadequate to their subsistence while he lives, must also pay 5l. per cent. to the Income and Property Tax, because the former pays so much on the *interest* of his property! A moment's reflection on this statement will convince any of your readers, that *equality* of annual income is far from being a *true* standard of ability to bear taxation, and that the *equal* pressure imposed on such very unequal powers of sustaining it, proves its *injustice*. The man of property has many advantages compared to him whose



income is the produce of his exertions, even while he lives on the *interest* of that property. Attend them both to the concluding scene of their lives! Each is probably surrounded by a mournful family, equal in number, but how utterly severe is the contrast. The property of the former descends to his widow and children, to console and maintain them; the latter can bequeath nothing to his disconsolate family but indigence and affliction! I am well aware, that this is one of the irremediable consequences of civil society; salaries cannot extend beyond the lives of their possessors; but this is surely an additional reason for their not being assessed so much beyond their proportion or ability.—It might, perhaps, be very difficult, not to say impossible, to fix on a standard of taxation so *exactly* proportionate to the different classes assessable to Income Tax, as to be exempt from error. But does it *therefore* follow, that the present inequalities and injustice in fixing the quantum of contribution, should remain? Would it not be far more consonant to reason and justice that all persons possessing pensions, salaries, or wages, or, in short, *any income for life only*, should be liable only to *half* as much per centum on such incomes, as land and stock-holders pay on their yearly income, *i. e.* on the *interest* of their property?—The only objection that could, with any semblance of reason, be opposed to a modification so clearly just and humane would be, that the Income Tax must be (*quoad hoc*) less productive.—To this I beg leave, with due deference to reply, that the present standard of contribution is not only erroneous in its principle, but inequitable in its *graduation*; and I humbly conceive a modification might, in this respect, be justly adopted, which would not merely compensate for the proposed deduction on life annuities, but afford a surplus more than sufficient to pay the interest of the present loan of 23,000,000*l.*

—Admitting, for argument sake, that *all* income is derived from the *same* origin, and is merely the annual *interest* of *real* property, it will follow, that the ratio of taxation should have a *progressive increase*, commensurate to the *income*; or, in other words, to the *ability* of contribution, and *value* of the *state* to be preserved by it.—Yet so far is this from being the case, that by the present Income Tax, though the above principle is clearly acknowledged, and in the *lowest* assessments actually adhered to, yet after the yearly income exceeds 150*l.*,

and precisely at the time when it should exert its most powerful and beneficial energy, its operation becomes *entirely* suspended! By the Income Tax, as it *now* stands, an income of 60*l.* per annum pays 1½ per cent. one of 150*l.* per annum 5 per cent: and one of 20,000*l.* per annum no more! Thus from the scanty pittance of 150*l.* per annum, (perhaps, too, an *annuity*, and incumbered with a family, 7*l.* 10*s.* is taken for Income Tax, leaving only 142*l.* 10*s.* for all other taxes and demands, while from the very liberal fortune of 2,000*l.* per annum, the interest of *real* property, and from the *princely revenue* of 20,000*l.* or 40,000*l.* per annum, the *same* ratio of 5 per cent. only is deducted! A tax thus constituted and levied, and that too with an addition last year of 2 per cent. on the former assessment, totally departs from its avowed principle, “that every one is bound to contribute to the public exigencies in proportion to his *ability, and to the stake he has to preserve.*” —Nothing is wanting to render this tax (as a *war* tax) equitable in itself, and highly beneficial to the public, but to approach as nearly as possible, to this standard of justice. The wisdom of the British Legislature is, doubtless, competent to this arduous task; and may, from various plans and modifications presented to them, select and arrange a plan of an income tax, in every respect more eligible and more productive than those which have hitherto been acted upon.—Without attempting to ascertain the exact ratio of ability between the various classes assessed to the Income and Property Tax, it must be universally admitted, that if the life annuitant were to pay in all cases where his income and that of the land or stock holder were equal, only *half* the percentage of the latter, he would still pay full as much, as (or perhaps more than) he *ought*, and yet find his present burden greatly alleviated.—When the pressure of other taxes, and the rapid advance of price on most of the necessities, as well as on the comforts of life are considered, it will surely be admitted, that no income whatever *under* 100*l.* per annum should be liable to assessment.—That all income arising from landed or funded property, or any permanent source, should pay for the first 100*l.* per annum 2*l.* per cent. and for every additional 100*l.* per annum, or the aliquot parts thereof, up to 2,000*l.* per annum, an addition of 1 per cent. on the *whole* income, as by the following table:

R



Per Ann.		Per Ann.
£ 100	at 2l. per cent.	£2 0
150	do. do.	3 0
200	do. do.	4 0
250	3l. do.	7 10
300	do. do.	9 0
350	4l. do.	14 0
400	do. do.	16 0
500	5l. do.	25 0
600	6l. do.	36 0
700	7l. do.	49 0
800	8l. do.	64 0
900	9l. do.	81 0
1,000	10l. do.	100 0
2,000	20l. do.	400 0

The intermediate sums between the 1,000l. and 2,000l. per annum, to pay in the same progressive proportion; the *maximum* for 2,000l. per annum and *upward*, being 20l. per cent. on the *original assessment*. But the *whole progressive series* to be liable to the advance of the last year's assessment, if judged necessary, and to commence from 5th April, 1806. To include (as at present) all real and personal property, trades, professions, &c.; but life annuitants of *all* descriptions, to be assessed one half less, liable to a proportional advance, on the *original assessment*.—E. G. a proprietor of 500l. per ann. estate, at 5 per cent. £25 0 0 per ann.

Advance last year 25 per cent. on assessment 6 5 0

£31 5 0

Annuitant of 500l. per ann. at 12½ per cent. 12 10 0

Advance for last year's assessment, 25 per ct. on assessment 3 2 6

£15 12 6

Having already observed that an Income Tax, thus modified, would be at once more equitable and more productive than the present, I shall forbear to expatiate on the great and evident national advantages that would result from such an alteration. In tracing this *mere outline* of a plan which is capable of great improvement, it is far from being my intention arrogantly to dictate to those whom I readily acknowledge to be as much my superiors in ability as in station, and to whom every source of information is accessible; yet, I trust it may be allowable, and I apprehend it to be my duty (with all due deference and respect to the public and to administration) to avail myself of the inestimable privilege which every British subject enjoys, of communicating his thoughts on political questions or measures in which

all are deeply interested.—BRITANNICUS.—  
25th March, 1806.

#### NATIONAL ECONOMY.

MR. COBBETT;—Although a distant, I am a constant reader of your weekly publication. I like and admire the principles on which that very entertaining and instructive work is founded. Yet, I often, (and I trust you will not think the worse of me,) differ with you in sentiment and opinion. I wish, Sir, to add my mite to our national reform and prosperity; by offering, through the medium of your Register, some subjects, the consideration of which may ultimately lead to them. If you think this worthy to meet the public eye, I may be induced to trouble you hereafter, more at large, perhaps, but not on a more important subject than on that of *national economy*. Upon this point, I have no reason to suppose we shall differ. It is *that* on which the prosperity, nay, the very existence of this country depends; and, truly happy am I to read the solemn pledge, which the Noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, has given on this head. I was not an admirer of the political conduct of those gentlemen who compose the present administration, when they formed the opposition phalanx. It appeared to me, they often thwarted measures which would have greatly tended to the public good, and instead of proposing others, seceded from parliament, withheld their counsels, and abandoned their duties as representatives of the people. But, Mr. Cobbett, as I am not a party man, I was inclined to think, others, under such circumstances, would have done the same; and that the loaves and the fishes were the only objects of their contemplation. When, however, on the death of Mr. Pitt, I was told, *all* the abilities of the country were to be united, to form a vigorous and effective administration, I felt no small degree of patriotic satisfaction, and ardent hope of future national prosperity. It is certain, the cream of four distinct parties has been taken to form the present administration, and the country looked to it with anxious expectation. For my own part, I thought some, and those very transcendent abilities, were excluded, and I much doubted, whether an administration composed of such heterogeneous matter could amalgamate and long hold together. To their first measures I looked with deep anxiety; apprehensive, I confess, that each man was not appointed exactly to his proper station; and, I think so yet. I mean, Sir, such as is best befitted to his political pursuits, his studies, and his abilities. Yet, I had no right to doubt that



general good intentions, and I trust they will acquit themselves with that zeal to which they are pledged, and with that honour, honesty, and integrity, which can alone support them in the public estimation; and the want of which must plunge them and the nation in disgrace, obloquy, and ruin.—But as my present subject is that of national economy, I shall confine myself to the conduct of the Noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I admire the abilities of that Noble Lord, though I by no means approve his system of taxation. That, however, is a matter of speculative opinion, and which I shall leave for animadversion on some future day. What I do approve; and I approve it most heartily; is his solemn promise, made to the representatives of the people, that his whole ministerial conduct shall be marked by the most rigid and exact economy. I ought not to suppose he will ever forget this pledge, to which he has bound himself by every tie of private honour and public faith. It may perhaps, be told, the items I am about to mention, do not, all at least, come exactly under his cognizance, or within the routine of his office. But, I conceive, Sir, the minister who has the guardianship of the public purse, must be consulted on every national demand upon it; and is accountable for its expenditure in some measure, at least, as far as his voice goes.—I shall first then, notice the immense cost of the sea fencibles, I will confidently appeal, and the appeal is reasonable and fair, to every admiral commanding at our several sea-ports, and to every commissioner in every dock-yard in the United Kingdom; if any benefit whatever has accrued to the naval service of Great Britain, by the institution of the sea fencibles? I would ask, if the abolition of them would not greatly contribute to man our ships of war? I would then ask the revenue officers, both of the customs and excise, if the protections given to sea fencibles do not greatly promote smuggling? Should their answers be such as I expect, will ministers hesitate to abolish this, not only useless, but obnoxious corps? Let the Noble Lord, who is the guardian of the public purse, look to the expense attending it. Let him consider the situation of the Hon. Admiral Geo. Berkeley, with a salary of £1500 for doing nothing here in England. Or, if he has any thing to do, if he visits the sea-ports, musters the fencibles, and inspects the impressed men, (a new fangled part of his official duty) who have perhaps, been rejected before, he will cost the nation twice that sum in post-horses, and travelling expenses. Let ministers, I say, ask those to

whom I have before appealed, if the labourer is worthy the hire? Then let them turn their eyes to Admiral Hawkins Whitshed, who fills the same post in Ireland, under the pompous name bestowed upon him by the late administration, of *Naval, confidential Adviser to the Lord Lieutenant*. Whether, with this new administration he has lost, or kept this high sounding title, I know not; but certain it is, the said admiral is just now sent back to Ireland, in the same situation; to call it a command would be ridiculous, and truly insulting to the navy. He enjoys too, the same appointment of 1500*l.* per annum, which Admiral Berkeley does here. Let them next compute the further expenditure under the various branches of this ridiculous and contemptible service. The pay of the captains, lieutenants, and a long list of others employed under them. And, sorry am I to add, these are invalided officers, who from wounds or length of service, might be entitled to attention and repose. But they are young and active, such as should be employed in *really* fighting the cause of their country; and should not be *put on full pay for doing nothing*. I am not, Sir, personally known to, or acquainted with either of the admirals, to whom I have alluded, I dare to say, they are very worthy and respectable men, both in their private, and professional characters. But I do not like their present employ. If they were dismissed from it, I should hope they would experience no great, or long inconvenience. The one is half brother to the Marchioness of Buckingham, the other married a namesake and relation of the Duke of Portland. Comfortable *births* would therefore, most likely be provided for them; though Mr. Secretary Fox is reported to have said jocosely, (speaking of the followers of the present administration) “that they were so thick as to be stored *three in a bed* already.” Be that however as it may. The whole sea-fencible establishment is what I object to. I wish it to be done completely away. An immense saving would be made to the public; many good seamen would be obtained for the real service of the navy; and smuggling would receive a very considerable check. The next object to which I would wish to turn the attention of the Noble Lord at the head of the Treasury, is that of *pensions*. I believe the evil is already so great, and increasing so fast, that it must shortly cure itself. But if it is left to work its own cure by time, it will leave, I fear, some dreadful marks and scars behind it. I highly approve the very liberal sum, I believe 90,000*l.* given by Mr. Burke’s Bill, to the crown annually, in order, not only to



support its dignity and splendour, but to enable the Monarch, who wears it, to enjoy the gratification of rewarding merit, and bestowing tokens of his royal munificence and personal regard, on those whom he thinks deserve them. I highly approve too, every mark of national gratitude, voted by the representatives of the people, to those who have essentially served the state, either in the cabinet or the field. The well-earned honours of a hard fought victory, would often become a dreadful charge to those on whom they are bestowed, if unaccompanied with a pecuniary gratuity. *But here let pensions stop.* No longer let each successive administration grant those pensions to the younger brothers, sisters, or daughters of rich and affluent peers, such as the Earl of Uxbridge and others; which ought to be reserved for, and bestowed only as the rewards of merit. And when the same administration retire from office, let not ALL the relations of ALL those who have given it their countenance and assistance be pensioned also. There is no end to this, Mr. Cobbett, we already see the tax-collectors sufficiently often at our doors, to levy our contributions for the necessary exigencies of the state, without being called upon to contribute towards the support of pensioned political friends, their relatives and dependents. And here, in the name of justice and reason, let me ask how the Noble Chancellor of the Exchequer could think of imposing another, and that so heavy a duty on sugar, (an article already over-taxed) as three shillings per cwt. whilst he should continue to exact from the planters of the Windward Islands four and a half per cent. on the produce of their estates, paid on the spot; and suffer the amount thereof still to be divided in pensions? This, Sir, in my idea, does not tally with the Noble Lord's plighted professions of economy. The duty to which I allude, was obtained by a positive compact between the mother country and her colonies: that the one should maintain an adequate, specified force for the defence of the other, the consideration of the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. duty, on the general produce of the latter. This agreement, Sir, has been violated under every administration, almost from the time it was made, so that no particular charge of violation can in that respect be adduced against the present one. No adequate force has ever been kept in those Islands for their defence; witness the depredations of the enemy there last year. Indeed, they have been often left to the protection, I should have said *mercy* of a black regiment. How much more honourable and just would it have been, how much

better would it have squared with the boasted resolution of economy of the Noble Lord, if, instead of imposing the additional heavy duty on sugar, which must be the ruin of the inferior planters of the smaller Islands, his lordship had appropriated the  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. duty to the public service, and exigencies of the state. It is true, he would thus have deprived some persons of pensions to which they have neither right nor title, from merit or service; but he would have rendered a double justice, and a double benefit both to the mother country and her colonies.—SENEX.—*East Bourne, April 6, 1806.*

## WAR TAXES.

SIR;—Your financial statements, from time to time, have naturally interested all reflecting persons who have had an opportunity of perusing them.—A letter from a correspondent of yours, addressed, lately, to Mr. Fox, particularly attracted my notice; because his figures appear to me to convey irrefragable demonstration, provided the fact be admitted from which they are deduced. But, if I am not mistaken, both you and he have most egregiously underrated the aggregate income of the country. Not being a man of figures or calculation myself, I desired a friend of mine, who by the by, I think has, like yourself, got rather a twist about the funds, to try if he could extract from the newspaper reports of Lord Henry Petty's budget, how things really stand. He has just handed me the enclosed, as he calls it, hasty sketch in round numbers, presuming upon our future expenditure during the war, to be equal to what it is now taken at; and that all the taxes will produce what they are laid at; though he is pleased to inform me the latter is impossible. As it evidently appears that the new administration agree in opinion with their predecessors, as to the solidity of our finances; I think it is a duty you \* owe the public, either to quiet the alarm you have incautiously given, by a candid acknowledgment of your error, or otherwise to defend your former opinions.—I for one would wish very much to know the truth, favourable or unfavourable: and, therefore, am extremely anxious to know your present opinion on this subject, which I own appears, as well as to yourself, of the first importance to your constant reader.—W. S.—*March 31st, 1806.*

\* This letter, it will be observed, was written previous to the publication of my article upon the Budget, in the Register of the 5th instant.





## WAR ESTABLISHMENT.

Dr. England.

To interest and charges on the consolidated fund taken at the same amount as stated by Lord Henry Petty for 1805 - - - - - 29,760,000

To 15-17ths of the total expenses for army, navy, ordnance, miscellaneous, &c. as stated by Lord Henry Petty, for the supply of the year 1806 - - - - - 43,618,472

---

£73,378,472

Cr.  
By income of the year 1806, arising from the permanent taxes, or more commonly denominated the Consolidated Fund, estimating this year according to the produce of the year 1805, as stated by Lord Henry Petty 33,000,000  
Malt and personal estate duty 2,750,000  
Lottery - - - - - 380,000  
War Taxes - - - - - 19,500,000  
Deficiency 17,748,472

---

£ 73,378,472

## PEACE ESTABLISHMENT.

Interest and charges on Consolidated Fund, &c. - - - 29,760,000  
Army, navy, &c. estimated at 25,240,000

---

£ 55,000,000

Permanent taxes as above - 33,000,000  
Malt and personal estate - 2,750,000  
Lottery - - - - - 380,000  
Deficiency 18,970,000

---

£ 55,000,000

It appears by the above statements that, allowing the consolidated fund to leave the same surplus as last year, and the annual produce of the malt duty and lottery to be the same, and also, that Cobbett is right in his opinion, "that the charge for army, navy, &c. cannot possibly be reduced below 25,000,000l.," there will be a deficiency of about 19,000,000l. on the peace establishment, *unless the war taxes be continued.*—This view is very different indeed from the declaration of Lord Henry Petty, "that the war taxes will not be necessary after the war."—It must however, also be admitted from the above statements, that if the war taxes be continued, and can possibly produce permanently about 20 millions per annum, without lessening the receipt from the old taxes, the Sinking Fund will have its full operation (whatever that may be) for the reduction of the national debt.—*March 30, 1806.*

## PROPERTY TAX AND SINKING FUND.

To the Right Hon. Charles James Fox.

SIR,—To the Chancellor of the Exchequer, we look for no other than accidental deviations from the pernicious principles of finance, adopted and pursued by his predecessor in office; 1st. Because prejudice, more or less in their favour, must in a manner, have been born with him, since they were the first that presented themselves to his untutored mind, 2d. Because it is more than ought to be expected from his age, that

he should have so far made himself acquainted with the bearings of these principles, as to be able to know, with something in the shape of certainty, the point to which they ought to be carried and no farther, so as to prevent their becoming a greater evil than that which they are intended to avert. And, 3d. Because he has not so far pledged himself, by his opposition to these principles, as to occasion any disappointment to the public, should he unfortunately, carry them farther than ever his predecessor has done. On these grounds, Sir, you can plead no excuse for your pursuit of Mr. Pitt's principles; for if you do not know the point to which they ought to be carried, and no farther, it is universally expected from your long and systematic opposition to his measures, on the score of finance, that you ought to know it; and, therefore, if you do not know it, the public shall not only have to lament the injury which they must sustain from your misinformation on this point; but that it shall be a crime in future to place confidence in any public character, however plausible, long, active, and systematic his opposition may be; and to make such opposition even a ground of hope, that the fundamental principles of public oppression shall ever meet with resistance from a man in power. I do not accuse you, Sir, with the relinquishment of those principles which you have so recently and repeatedly held forth to the electors of Westminster, as the criterion by which they are to judge of your title to the continuance of



their confidence; nor do I say that you will ever relinquish them; but, judging from your tacit approbation of the measures pursued in India, and the few doubts which you seem to have in your mind as to the merits of Mr. Tierney's treating bill; from your adherence to the sinking fund, funding system, and the property tax, and from the great and unexpected delicacy, with which you would meddle with the Irish Union, or any other measure, however bad, which has once passed into law, I will say, what I fear is more than possible; namely, that before you hold your present situation half so long as Mr. Pitt has held his premiership, you will fritter away, and modify your principles so far as to make it a matter of indifference to your constituents, or the public, whether you hold them or not. I am far, however, from supposing that this apparent desertion of principles, appears to yourself otherways than the least of two evils, under all the circumstances of the case. You may justly plead in extenuation of it, that a system radically vicious requires means radically vicious to support it; that a system of fraud and plunder abroad, must be supported by a system of a similar nature at home; that the plunderers of Asia, and the blood-suckers of the Stock Exchange must be supported; and, therefore, that directly or indirectly the burden must fall upon the public. That you depend upon these characters more, perhaps, than on parliament for the vicious means which you must have to support this vicious system; and, therefore, that you can only hold your place, and retain a chance of serving the public, by giving them bonuses and premiums at the public expense, on the loan of money, "which," as Mr. Tierney truly observes, "cost them no more than the paper on which they write." But, lamentably true as these facts are, or whatever may be your resources, still it cannot cease to be the duty of men out of power, while they endeavour to find for it every possible excuse, to watch the shades by which men in power part with the principles which they held out of power; and to hold up to the execration of a ruined and deluded public, the vices of the system which can no longer exist, than *vicious means are made use of to continue its duration*. Under these impressions, Sir, and finding by this day's newspaper, "that you have not yet met with an argument which has altered your opinion as to the merits of the Sinking Fund," I shall make no apology for calling your attention to the few remarks which I feel it my duty to make, not upon that fund and property tax, but on the principles on which they are considered

by you and others, as the means of supporting public credit, with all its advantages. Credit, Sir, judging from the misfortunes of some, and the fortunes of others, rests itself solely upon two principles, *insensible* to the danger of trusting, and a *sense* of the solidity of the security on which we lend our property; and the one forms as powerful a support as the other, while suspicion of danger remains asleep. It is true, many escape ruin with pleasure, because they were insensible of the danger which threatens them; but many more are forever undone, because they were not awake to the cause of their ruin. I therefore, conclude, that to make public insensibility however powerful it may be, the basis of credit, is a crime for which no speculator, state, or any other, can offer an excuse, and much less make an atonement. Let us then, Sir, since, as members of the community, we have no different interests to pursue, endeavour, in the spirit of truth and candour, to ascertain which of these two principles, *sensibility* or *insensibility*, do the sinking fund and property tax, make use of to support public credit. With respect to the property tax, you are made to say, by the reporter for the Morning Chronicle, "it may be said, and it has been said (by Mr. Francis) that there is no security against its being still gradually raised. But then, I certainly think, that the present mode" (doubling it at once) "is preferable to advancing it 1 per cent. one year, and 1½ per cent. another year, and so on, which would at last lead to a constant gradual advance, that might in the end *annihilate all property*." (By the annihilation of all property, I take it for granted you mean the conversion of it into taxes.) As taxes annihilate property, and as property annihilated is no security for new debts, the part remaining of our property annihilated, forms the security for every addition which may be made to the public debt. When Lord Sidmouth introduced the property tax, he gave the annual income of the nation from every source; labour, trade, land, and money, at 80,000,000 l. At that time the expenses of government, the interest of the funds, the poor's-rate, the county-rate, the tythes, and the contributions which are annually given to support hospitals, alms-houses, and private charities, amounted, exclusive of law expenses, or the price of justice, all of which are taxes, to about 72,000,000 l. or 9-tenths of our annual income. Consequently, there remained of it then to be annihilated but 1-10th. and that tenth is now annihilated to the amount of the property, and all other taxes since imposed upon the public. Sep-



ing then that all taxes annihilated the security of public credit, and that the annihilation already exceed 9-10ths of the security, is it possible to conceive that the property tax makes use of any other principle to support public credit, than public insensibility as to the extent to which the security is already mortgaged? If I have erred, Sir, in this alarming calculation, it will be found, I am confident, that Lord Sidmouth is more to blame for taking the income at too little, than I am in giving the expenditure at too much. But be this as it may, those who boast of the *security* of public credit, should take up my principle of calculation, for all others are insecure, and ascertain how far it is loaded, and not take the *facility* with which loans can be had for their *proof*; for that *proves* nothing but public insensibility, the facility with which promises on paper, the thinnest and worst of all papers, can be blown into circulation, and the folly, if not the wickedness, of those who pursue measures which demand its support, to "*the annihilation of all property*." Having thus, Sir, disposed of the property tax, we come of course to inquire whether public sensibility or insensibility, be the principles which the Sinking Fund makes use of to support public credit. *Annihilated* as the public security is, this inquiry is more a subject of amusement than of use, but as there is that pleasure in detecting falsehood, which the love of truth inspires, the question ought to be tried as if the public security were at this moment whole and unincumbered. Lord Henry Petty observes, that "had it not been for the Sinking Fund, we should now have been loaded with the whole charges now born by the country, without deriving any of its advantages; because, if we could borrow at all, it would have been on bad terms, and we should have created more debt, to obtain that which through the Sinking Fund we have obtained on more favourable terms;" namely, "*the indemnification for the past, and security for the future*," which we have derived from the "*just and necessary wars*" of the last fourteen years!!! "The Sinking Fund, over and above that it *leads* to the extinction of the national debt, has been a saving of the burden, while it seems to increase." Exclusive of indemnity for the past, and security for the future, the point of this *statesman or Pitt-like argument* is, that the Sinking Fund diminishes the public debt, and leaves the public less interest to pay; and that it keeps up the price of the funds, and therefore bears down the rate of interest. This logic is perfectly good, had the circumstances which go-

vern the case been duly attended to. It cannot, however, mean actually that the debt is less, and that, throwing the influence of the hopes of a speedy peace on the price of the funds out of the question, the rate of interest is lower than it was when the Sinking Fund commenced its operations in 1786. For, by comparison, and allowing for the effect, on the price of the funds, of that degree of boldness, which the suspension of cash payments at the Bank, and the consequent facility (because there is no other danger of being called upon for cash) of circulating paper money have given to the loan-mongers, we shall find that the debt has greatly increased, and the rate of interest considerably risen since 1786. His lordship, therefore, can only mean that the debt and rate of interest are relatively less than they would have been, but for the influence of the Sinking Fund. He has, however, forgot the circumstances which govern the case. The annual accumulation of the public debt, far exceeds its yearly liquidation. In reality, therefore, and it is impossible to misconceive the fact when once brought into mind, the sum paid off, for instance, in 1805, is again borrowed in the loan of 1806, and so on from the beginning of the Sinking Fund. The Sinking Fund, therefore, recreates the very debt which it discharges; and the truth of the fact is proved by the conviction, that if the sum annually allowed to discharge the debt were applied to the yearly payment of the army or navy, the necessity of borrowing annually to that amount for such purpose, could not possibly exist; consequently, it is impossible, naturally so, that the Sinking Fund, relatively any more actually, can have diminished the debt or lowered the rate of interest, more than they would have been had the fund never been applied. This being the fact, all the merits which you allow to the Sinking Fund, naturally falls to the ground, and it brings us to a positive conviction that the fund makes use of no other principle to support public credit, than public insensibility, as to the impotence of its power, under an accumulating debt, even to its own amount. How then comes it, Sir, that men equally interested in the truth, and equally sincere in their endeavours to avoid error on this subject, should hold down right opposite opinions as to its merits? I will give you, Sir, what I believe even to positive conviction to be the cause, and I hope that, to prevent any suspicion of your own financial talents or political integrity, you will give your reason, in the course of the observations which you shall have to make on the Sinking Fund, before you are



able to dispose of the Property Tax; *that last great effort "TO ANNIHILATE ALL PROPERTY," and to save what?* Taking those who differ with me in opinion to be honest men, and leaving public insensibility on the subject to which I have so often alluded out of the question, I take the cause of our opposite opinions to be, the supposed tendency, in their opinion, which the weekly application of the sum applied to the redemption of the debt, has to create a scarcity of stock; and, therefore, to raise the value of the funds so as to enable us to borrow at a proportional low rate of interest. But, it is forgotten in this supposition that the Sinking Fund recreates the very debt which it redeems; or, in effect, that money is borrowed to purchase the sum redeemed. In this supposition, therefore, it is forgotten that the annual funding of this sum lowers the value of the stocks in the very proportion in which the annual redemption of its equivalent raises their price; and forgetting these considerations, it is not conceived that the supposition would almost disgrace the intellects of an infant, because it is false and inapplicable under the circumstances of the case, on the clearest principle of gravitation or of weight, placed against an equal weight in a balancing scale. But, granting for the sake of argument, that which in the end will prove false in all cases; namely, that, in this case, the laws of nature give way to the rules of art, and, therefore, that the bustle created weekly in the market by the redeeming commissioners, raises the price of stocks, more than the annual noise made by the funding minister lowers their value; will you, Sir, undertake to exhibit what the consequent saving of interest will amount to per cent. on the sum annually borrowed? If you will not, you are, Sir, but grovelling in the dark for your object; and your dependance upon an ideal principle, will only expose your country and fame to ruin, because a patriot and a man of information, will not hold as politically good, a mere principle which is morally bad, so far as it has a tendency to, nay, *actually do create public insensibility*, as to the danger which must sooner or later result from any farther encroachment on the less than a tenth of our property, which yet remains unannihilated.—The subject of these remarks may be thus compressed. You assume, Sir, that the Property Tax naturally helps to support public credit, because it keeps up the price of the funds, by removing the necessity of an annual loan to the amount of its yearly production. I deny this effect, and impute the contingent influence upon the funds, which I admit, to

public *insensibility* of the annihilating effect which the tax naturally has upon public security; and to the facility with which millions of the promises lent may be written, and, therefore, borrowed. And, as a collateral proof, I appeal to your own conviction, Sir, whether it be *a sense* of the *solidity* of public security, or, *the fear* of one party that the other *will overbid it* for that loan, that produces *what is called their LIBERAL terms*; or, *your proof* of undiminished resources\*. You assume, Sir, that the Sinking Fund naturally supports public credit, because it relatively extinguishes the national debt. I deny the relative extinction, because the application of the millions applied to the liquidation of the debt, creates the necessity of borrowing an equal sum for the public service. But, admitting that I am altogether mistaken on those points, am I so, Sir, on these? 1st. If the Sinking Fund is capable of discharging the debt, will not the stockholder be put into possession of the capital at present invested in the funds? 2d. Before they are put into possession of it, must not government take it from the public in taxes; and when they are in possession of it, must they not invest it in land and trade? 3d. If so invested, will not the depreciation on the circulating medium be in the proportion which the capital of the debt bears to the medium of exchange at present in circulation? And, 4th. If so, will not the evil of taking the capital of the debt from the public in taxes, added to that of the *then* depreciation in money, far outdo the oppression which at present arises from its interest; and annihilate public credit altogether? If you are unable, Sir, by fair reasoning, and in a detailed argument, to put the negative on these questions, I shall flatter myself that you have heard an argument which has altered your opinion as to the merits of the Sinking Fund; if not opened your eyes to the principle of the remedy which you ought to adopt, to prevent the annihilation of all property, or rather the transfer and re-transfer of it, God only knows how many times, by the time that the Sinking Fund extinguishes the national debt.—C. S.

\* The advantages of this competition, if the false ideas of national prosperity which it gives, ever left it any merit, is now lost for ever. For the competition for the last loan is confessedly a sham, the parties themselves having confessed, if I am not mistaken, that it was priorly agreed upon to divide it between them. And to my own knowledge this is not the only case in which the plan was adopted by former competitors.



## CLERGY NON-RESIDENCE.

SIR ;—Being a member of the Church of England, and being such neither from accident nor necessity, but from a conviction that it is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, I cannot but regard with peculiar interest whatever may tend to its prosperity, or to the comfort and happiness of its ministers.—That this is a time in which the enemies of our establishment, are more than ordinarily active in propagating their hostile doctrines, and in their endeavours to effect its downfall, we cannot but know from daily observation, and knowing we cannot but lament. But, in mere lamentation its true sons will not suffer their care to terminate. Such a mother expects, and, from such sons her expectations will not be vain, more than lamentation. They will not lie down on the bed of despair, but rouse themselves up for the contest, and gird on their armour; they will, when need requires, stand forth to shield her from harm, and, though her enemies be mighty and numerous, they will not fear nor be dismayed, but “be strong and quit themselves like men.”—Think not, Sir, that in adopting such language, I am sounding the trumpet of discord, of blood, of bigotry, or of superstition. No! Persecution for religious tenets I utterly abhor. Fire, and faggot, and the axe for the extermination of contrariety of opinion, I cannot away with. Far other weapons, in my judgment, become the Christian soldier; weapons which the word of God allows, and which that same word and his grace supply.—But, I am extending too widely the remarks intended to be offered in this communication. One observation more, therefore, and then let us to the point. The Christian soldier will generally be a prudent soldier, and a prudent soldier will not only be prepared to withstand and repel the attack of an enemy, but he will strive sedulously totally to avert it; and, in order to this, he will avoid as far as possible giving occasion of offence.—One of the dangers which most imminently threaten our church at present, proceeds from the increasing number of seceders. Never indeed, did lust of separation, and consequent hostility more abound than in these our days.—Now, as the most probable means of restraining this, I have ever regarded the Residence of the Clergy in their respective parishes.—There are doubtless cases, in which to acquire residence, would be to require almost an impossibility; or, at least, what could not be enforced without manifest cruelty and oppression. But these

cases are rare.—There are also cases, where, unhappily such variance has arisen between the minister and his parishioners, respecting the payment of tithes, or from other causes; and such prejudices have been conceived by the one against the other, that the interests of the people (I mean their spiritual interests) would indisputably be more successfully promoted by a curate than by the incumbent. But, these cases also, we trust, are few in number. Where, however, they do occur, let a dispensation be granted; but, at the same time, let care be taken that the cause of the dispensation (I mean, when it proceeds from want of a *proper* habitation) be as speedily as possible removed, and then let the indulgence cease. Thus much equity admits; thus much equity demands. But let not every trivial excuse; a trifling inconvenience; a house not sufficiently elegant or commodious; the want of the aid and comfort of society; or the absence from friends, be pleaded by ministers as a justification for the dereliction of their duty; or, if ministers are to be found so disregardful of their solemn engagements as to offer such pleas, let them not be admitted.—To these remarks, Sir, I have been led by a letter which appeared in your Register of March 22, (p. 422) addressed to Mr. Windham. Its purport is, to obtain that gentleman's support for the repeal of the Residence Act; which support the writer is induced to expect from the liberal ideas expressed by Mr. W. at the time when that act passed. It is signed Senex; and from the feelingness with which the supposed hardships of the clergy are described, I was for some time led to imagine that it had proceeded from the pen of a clergyman; but, upon further consideration, I could not but think that some enemy under the assumed garb of friendship, was thus labouring to impose an additional load on that burden, under which he hypocritically bewails the clergy are already suffering. We know that such insidious means have not unfrequently been resorted to; and from an attentive examination of that letter, I scruple not to pronounce that its writer is, to speak most favourably, *not a friend* to our establishment. From such insinuations it is that the fair character of the clergy is blackened to their foes, and even to their friends a cloud is cast over it.—That Mr. W. should be imposed upon by such an effusion, cannot for a moment be supposed. On this point I feel no anxiety. His mind, liberal as it is, is also just; and will readily discriminate between real grievance and causeless discontent. Still, Sir, I did entertain a hope that you, or some of your correspondents, more



fitted for the task than myself, would have remarked upon the letter of Senex, and pointed out to the mass of your numerous readers, the utter insufficiency of the pleas advanced by him for the necessity of the Residence Act being repealed. No notice, however, having been taken of it in your succeeding number, I feel myself called upon thus to become your correspondent; and trust that my undertaking will not prove altogether unsatisfactory.—The well established impartiality of your Register emboldens me to hope, that having presented your readers with one side of a question, you will not refuse to let the other be submitted to their inspection through the same channel.—It is said, by Senex, that “the present law is more oppressive than the Act of Henry the 8th., because the informer can now recover five times as much as he could by that Act.” This is not altogether a fair statement; for by the present law the informer cannot recover one farthing, if the bishop’s licence for non-residence be obtained: and, it remains with Senex to mention an instance where that licence has been refused where a sufficient plea was offered.—The parallel between the clergy, and the country gentlemen will not hold out.—That the latter should reside *part* of the year upon his estates, *may be* a moral duty, but that the clergy should reside the *whole* is a moral duty.—The law has certainly “made provision for the duties of the clergy;” but not “by allowing curates.” The office of curate was originally not so much to *supply the place* of incumbent, as to *assist* him: as in the case of pluralities of livings, or where the clergyman was old and infirm.—That “*young curates*” may be “*respectable*,” we are far from denying, nay, we have the honour (for an honour we esteem it) of being intimately connected with many that are such; but, why, we would ask, may not *old incumbents* be equally so? *Young curates* may have greater powers of voice; but there are few old clergymen, we believe, whose voice is not loud enough to be heard in a church in the country, where in general the churches are not very large, neither are the congregations very numerous. And, let it be here observed, that Senex alludes chiefly to incumbents in the *country*, as appears from his lamenting their wanting “the aid and comfort of the society in towns.” Besides, it happens not very unfrequently, that the curate is as old as the incumbent.—As to all the other parochial duties, it were madness to suppose that they would not be even *better* performed by the old than by the young. For, must not the former, from

long habits of intimacy, be more thoroughly acquainted with the various characters and dispositions of his people; and, consequently, must he not best know how to adapt his instructions to their advantage? May we not also suppose, without any disparagement to the younger clergy, that a conscientious minister, who has long resided among his parishioners, will be looked up to with more reverence and respect? That in visiting the sick, one of the most important of the ministerial duties, his exhortations, admonitions, and consolations, will be applied more appropriately, and more effectually? and that, in fine, his general conduct, which we may reasonably conclude, will, in the decline of life, be more circumspect, will carry with it greater weight, and that it will be more readily and carefully imitated? “Bishops and the superior clergy may, most of them, have been curates in their younger days.” But we hope that, as they rise in years and in preferment, they do not sink in their regard to their duty, or that that respectability which they possessed when young, and which perchance aided them in their advancement, is, now that they have attained the wished-for eminence, forfeited by any change of conduct. Such libellous opinions we cannot entertain.—It may be that “no complaint was ever brought against the clergy in parliament for non-residence.” But, surely, there was abundant ground for it before the passing of the late act; and much as we reprobate the *qui tam* measures, still we are of opinion that those measures have eventually been of service: those measures caused to be brought forward the late act, and that act, inasmuch as it has caused a more general residence of the clergy, is, we maintain, salutary. Whether its powers have been committed in every instance to the most proper hands, and whether those powers have been sufficiently defined, are questions with which we are not now concerned. The only point insisted upon, is that the residence of the clergy is a duty which ought to be enforced, and every act which tends to that, unless indeed it be cruelly oppressive, is to be commended, and its supporters “deserve well of the public.—Inclination and duty” we allow are better “motives than what are enforced by an act;” but why with inclination and duty, has Senex coupled that servile term “*interest*?” If by interest be meant, the bare saving of the salary allowed to a curate, or any other such consideration, in what consists the difference between residing from such motives, and “from dread of pains and penalties?”



"—It is natural for men to hope to have the "privilege of living, in the decline of life, "where they please." But, where, it may be asked, could they, "after having spent "their best days in the duties of their parish," where could they more wish to repose, than in that same parish? Where may they look for aid, if not at the hand of those for whom they have so long laboured? Where for comfort, if not in contemplating those good seeds, which they, themselves, have sown, maturing and bringing forth fruit? Where shall they find friends, if not amongst those, who are endeared to them by the strong ties of gratitude; on whom they have been conferring the most important obligations, viz. Instructing them how to secure those treasures which will never fail, eternal in the heavens. Where shall they look for society, if not in the company of those, who have so long been their fellow travellers through life, and with whom they may humbly hope still to go on, hand in hand, till they arrive at the kingdom of heaven, and their receive the reward of their labour? Surely, to a good man, his own parish cannot but afford all "the aid and comfort of society, all the "friendships and relationships," which a good man can desire.—That "the clergy "of the church of England are subject to "hardships" is but too true. We well know many hardships that exist, and, we also know some clergymen, who suffer under them; who feel, yet complain not; who sigh, yet submit. But such of them as "discharge their duty with zeal and ability" will never, we are persuaded, reckon amongst their hardships, the being required to remain at their posts, and that too in "these most critical and trying times of "public danger:" there it is, that duty requires them, for there it is that their zeal and ability can be most successfully exerted. Many other remarks upon the letter of Senex might be offered, but already, Sir, your time and patience have been too much intruded upon. Without, therefore, commenting further, I shall conclude, with subscribing myself, your obedient servant, M. N.—*New-Brentford, April 2, 1806.*

## TREATING BILL.

SIR,—I do not find myself frequently dissenting from your opinions, for they are founded on principles of too much integrity of independence, and matured by too much judgment and reflection, and directed to objects of too great an importance, to be easily controverted. But I cannot coincide in your view of the bill of Mr. Tierney for

amending the Treating Act. As your liberal candour has rendered this Register open to every writer whose intentions and wishes are directed to the interest of his country, you will perhaps allow these few remarks to be inserted in it. I think you have not, in deciding on the merits of this bill, extended your observations to the great advantage which will result from obliging the electors who reside at a distance from the place of election, to pay their own expenses in travelling there. The consideration which presses itself strongly on my mind, and which makes me extremely anxious that this bill should pass; is this: that it will have the effect of redressing a great grievance in the representation of boroughs. The cases are numerous in which the inhabitants of boroughs possess all the claims to a representation which are given by birth, inhabitancy, and property. Claims on which the principle of representation was first founded, and on which it ought to continue, and yet are prevented, not only from participating in it, but are totally excluded; whilst, on the other hand, strangers having none of these claims to constitute their right, but in every respect unconnected with the interests of the borough, alone enjoy the privilege of returning its members. The representation of boroughs has been called the rotten part of this constitution; but I do not thus opprobriously speak of it, when I see some powerful Peer, who has by acts of benevolence secured the love and affection of his tenants and dependents, consulted by them for the choice of a representative for their borough, neither would I condemn the system, if a part of the electors were strangers, and even admitted for the sole purpose of an election. But, Mr. Cobbett, when I perceive the rights of a borough wrested from the legal proprietors and usurped by a few individuals, for the purpose of making an election dictated by the elected, who visit the place only when this purpose renders it necessary, and who contribute to none of its burthens; when these and these only exercise the privilege of electing representatives, and the inhabitants, who have property for which they claim security, that it shall not be disposed of without their consent, and who are obliged to defray all the expenses of the borough, are denied the right of joining in the election; then, Sir, I exclaim against the system as bring a rotten part of the constitution, with this consideration, that, as it is the glory of the British constitution that its foundation rests on the love of confidence of the people, we must regret whenever there is a shadow of cause for dissatisfaction.



It behoves us, Sir, when assailed by foes from without to guard against foes within. Were you to talk to these inhabitants of their representatives, you would insult their feelings, I have not exaggerated this grievance. I was passing through a small borough in the county of Dorset, a few days since, in which I witnessed its greatest extent. One of the sitting members had vacated his seat, or in other words, the stipulated period for which he was to retain it having expired, he had legally resigned it into the hands of the donor to be transferred to another, and this successor was then to be elected. The right of election was vested in freemen, the greater number of whom resided at a considerable distance from the borough. The intended representative collected them on his way from London to the place of election, at which the few remaining formalities of the law had required their attendance. From the description of the electors, I should judge they had become such on this rule: that the more remote they lived from the borough, and the more alienated they were from its interests, the more qualified were they to determine the merit of him whom the constitution had appointed the guardian of the borough. Still, however, they returned the member, whilst 100 of the inhabitants, possessed of property, residents from their birth, and bearing the burthens of the town, were not even allowed to share in the exercise of that right on which is formed a branch of the government. With what confidence, they asked, can we give instructions to their own representatives, or with what hope can we consider them as the guardians of our privileges, when they become such by invading them? This is the grievance of which I have always complained in the representation of boroughs, and it appears likely to be remedied by Mr. Tierney's bill. If these *honorary* freemen were obliged to defray the expenses of travelling to the borough, when their master requires their attendance at an election, you would find that, unless the individual on whose account they are made, can render them some compensation, they will be extremely cautious of involving themselves in expense, when they can answer the reproaches of ingratitude for disregarding this maker of honorary freeman, by pleading the injustice of violating the rights of others. You will, at least, have the representatives of boroughs, not the representatives of one individual, but of that community in whom this right was vested by the constitution; and the electors will be so far from considering Mr. Tierney

as depriving them of their franchises, that they will owe him their lasting gratitude for restoring them. I am, Sir, yours, &c.  
W. B.—*Temple, 19th March.*

#### AFFAIRS OF INDIA.

SIR.—The candour and impartiality of your Weekly Register, and the readiness with which, upon all occasions, you admit into it any remarks, though in opposition to your own sentiments, induce me to give my opinion on a subject, which you do not seem accurately to have understood.—When the charter of the East India Company was renewed in 1793, the sum of half a million sterling a year was to be paid into the Exchequer, provided there should be a surplus in each year, equal to that sum, after paying a variety of expences, which were first to be made from the resources of the East India Company.—It follows, therefore, of course, that if, since 1793, there have not been assets sufficient to pay all the charges which were to *precede* the payment of half a million annually to the Exchequer, the Company cannot be said to be indebted several millions to the public, unless an unexpected change should take place prior to the expiration of the charter.—But another question now comes, which is, whether the nation was deluded by a false statement of the assets of the Company in 1793; and thereby led to expect a pecuniary aid from India, which it was impossible to realise.—To this I answer, that after the fullest investigation of the Company's affairs, it did not appear at the time, that Lord Melville had overstated the expected *receipts* of revenue in India, or the profits of the Company's sales in England. The *experience* of sixteen years has *proved*, that the revenues of India have *exceeded*, in sixteen years, the amount at which they were estimated by Lord Melville, at least in the proportion of *one third*. If, then, you should ask, why it is that the half million was paid in a single year only, the answer would be very easy; because the *expences* in India have *exceeded* Lord Melville's calculation, in a proportion far greater than that in which the revenues have gone beyond his calculation.—It is possible that this excess of expenditure, beyond the estimate of 1793, might have been unavoidable. It is possible that it might have been occasioned by wars imprudently waged. It is possible it might have been occasioned by the unnecessary increase of an army, which many thought was, in 1793, fully equal to any service that might have been required from it. It is also possible, that the wars in which the



nation has been engaged in India, were unavoidable; that they were commenced on principles of the soundest policy, and conducted with strict economy, and with great military skill.—These, Mr. Cobbett, are points which are to be determined by the enquiry now pending in the House of Commons; but most assuredly, as you now think, the East India Company are free from all blame, if it should hereafter be proved, that unnecessary wars in India have been expensively conducted, or that the civil and military establishments in India have been much higher than necessity required. The power of fixing those establishments was actually in his majesty's ministers; and they had, in fact, the appointment of governors and commanders in chief. The Directors could not even *censure* a governor without the consent of the king's ministers. I know of no difference between the bill proposed by Mr. Fox in 1782, and that of Mr. Pitt which passed into a law in 1784, and was renewed in 1793, but this; Mr. Fox's bill threw the whole patronage, both at home and in India, into the hands of commissioners nominated by parliament. The bill of Mr. Pitt left to the Company a very considerable extent of patronage at home, but it gave to commissioners appointed by his Majesty, as complete *political power*, as was to have been given to the parliamentary commissioners under Mr. Fox's bill. It follows, therefore, that his Majesty's late ministers are entitled to all the credit, or to all the discredit, that may be due, for the good or bad government of India from 1784 to this day.—I own it has very much astonished me, to find sensible men, of all parties, so ignorant on a subject free from every thing like obscurity. Since the year 1784, the most accurate accounts have been delivered to parliament, of the receipts and expenditure, in each year, in India. If any gentleman will look at these accounts, he will see that the revenues of each year have been in a progressive state of *increase*, until they amount at present to more than twelve millions sterling a year. They will see, at the same time, that the debt of India is much more than double, nearly *treble*, the amount at which it stood in 1784. They will observe also, that from 1765 to 1784, no bullion was sent from *England to India*, though within that period a very considerable quantity of bullion was brought from *India to England*. They will observe also, that since 1784, bullion to a very considerable amount has been sent from *England to India*, and that the bills drawn upon *England*, by the governments in India, between

1784 and 1805, very far exceed in amount the bills drawn from 1765 to 1784. If the information stopped *here*, I should not wonder that the question was asked, how has all this happened? Yet the same accounts shew how the revenues have been expended, and how the debt has been more than doubled. A certain sum has been appropriated, in each year, to the purchase of investments, and the remaining revenues have been expended in paying the civil and military expences of India. The result then is this, that the revenues of India have not been sufficient, from 1784 to 1806, to pay the expences of India, and for the investments sent home, in the precise sum that the debt has been increased since 1784, in the first place; in the second, to the amount of the bullion sent from England to India; and in the third, to the amount of the bills drawn upon England by the governments of India. If, upon investigation, it shall appear, that the civil and military establishments of India have been fixed upon a higher scale than was necessary, where will the censure fall? Not on the Directors most assuredly, but on the Commissioners. If it shall appear that hostilities were unnecessarily carried on against the native powers, when the expense must, in the nature of things, have been enormous, because a large army in the field, at a great distance from our own frontiers, is much more expensive than a large army in garrisons and cantonments, on whom must the censure fall? Certainly not on the Directors, who could not have been consulted as to the prudence of those wars, and whose *opinion* went for nothing after all, if his Majesty's ministers did not concur in their opinion.—For the commercial concerns of the Company, the Directors most undoubtedly are responsible; but his Majesty's late ministers, and the governments in India, who were under the controul of those ministers, are to be praised or censured, as the political transactions in India shall appear, on investigation, to have been wise or impolitic.—J. S. W.—*Brighton, 14th April, 1806.*

#### LLOYD'S FUND.

SIR,—Your known impartiality induces me to hope that you will insert the following observations addressed to the Committee at Lloyd's in your weekly paper.—Impressed as I was, in common with all my countrymen, with sentiments of gratitude and respect towards the heroes who in the brilliant victories off Trafalgar, raised the British flag to an unparalleled pitch of renown, I seized with eager-



ness the earliest opportunity of offering my mite to the Patriotic Fund: a fund, both *nominally* and *virtually* endowed for the benefit of the widows and orphans of those who fell in the action. What then was my surprise when I perused the resolutions which proposed the donation of swords, and other expensive rewards to the commanders of the respective ships: and how much is that surprise now increased, when I perceive the continuation of the same system manifested in the large sums voted to Sir T. Duckworth, Admiral Cochrane, &c. for their conduct in the late decisive action in the West Indies. Far be it from me to depreciate in the slightest degree, the merits of the gallant commanders of our fleets:—I respect them as the saviours of my country. But, I appeal to every one of them, (and I am confident in the justice of my appeal) whether they would not prefer the soothing reflection that the families of their brave departed messmates are provided with the comforts and blessings of life, to the possession of gaudy trinkets, and useless decorations? Let it not be said, that the funds are adequate to both purposes; for were it not infinitely preferable to increase the charitable benefactions, beyond what is necessary for mere subsistence, than to offer superfluous rewards to those whose glory is elevated far above the remuneration, which such trivial ornaments can bestow? Moreover, in a constitutional point of view, I would ask, whether a self-created committee is empowered to award the recompence of military merit, which has hitherto been considered a privilege inherent in the Crown and Senate?—When the committee thought fit to promote a general collection at the parish churches, many thinking men objected to such a precedent, but the objection was overruled by the supposed benevolence of the intention. Can it for a moment be supposed, that either public or private contributions to the fund, had in contemplation the objects now pursued? and would not the ends of benevolence, justice, and sound policy, be infinitely better answered, by alleviating misery to the utmost limits of liberality, than by offering inadequate rewards to superior merit?—I remain, Sir, your faithful and devoted servant,

W. C.

## FOREIGN OFFICIAL PAPER.

FRENCH ANNUAL EXPOSÉ, at the Opening of the Session of the Legislative Body at Paris, March 3, 1805. (Concluded from p. 480.)

The first has already enlivened all those  
ose countries, to which it promises a new

existence; the second connecting with the Loire and the Vilaine, will terminate in four channels at the sea, and will convey from all quarters to the western departments, the productions of commerce, and naval stores. Several others are projected, as that of the Censee, destined to unite the Sambe and the Scheldt; that of Ypres, which will shorten the communication of Lisle with the sea; those which are to be carried along the Haisne, the Vesle, and the Aisne; and, lastly, the lateral canal of the Loire, going from Digouin to Briare, and rendering easy and practicable, in every season, the navigation of the most beautiful and changeable of our rivers.—History has preserved the names of the princes, who, in ancient times rendered their reigns illustrious by similar works; the most flourishing states are indebted to them for their internal prosperity. What a glorious futurity is promised to French industry, by a solicitude which thus extends and multiplies them, amidst so many other cares, in every part of the empire.—If you cast your eyes on our ports, you will see that exertions are making on both seas, to render them more accessible, more commodious, and more secure. Basins are digging at Antwerp; sluices and canals are forming Antwerp, Dieppe, Ostend, Dunkirk, and Havre. At Honfleur, Bordeaux, Nice, Hulingnen, Belle-isle, Ajaccio, and Bastia, quays are constructed, and jetties or moles lengthened or rebuilt. All these different kinds of works are carrying on at Rochelle. The cleansing of the ports of Cette and Marseilles is continued, and that of Oleron is enlarging. The ports of Diclette and Casteret are prepared in such a manner as to be capable of receiving a great number of vessels and gun-boats, which will alarm the inhabitants of the English islands of Jersey and Guernsey, as those at Boulogne menace Dover and London. The soundings taken at Bruc have afforded satisfactory results; the Rhone will have a port. Engineers have examined what improvements it is possible to make in that of Genoa. Six millions eight hundred and fifty thousand francs have been expended on the military ports. This sum has been principally applied in the excavations, the jetties of the Mole, the construction of the outer port and basin, and the foundation of the new port, Bonaparte, which, destined to complete this beautiful maritime creation, and worthy of his name, will be, on the Channel, the terror of England; at Boulogne, the basin and the sluice, the completion of the works which constitute the whole of the port, and the construction of the establishments by which it is sur-



rounded; at Ambleteuse, the works necessary for deepening the port, the elevation of the jetty, which protects it from the sand driven against it by the west winds, the line-walls, and the buildings; at Brest, the formation of an artificial island, the excavations in the rock, the hospitals, the magazines, the arsenal, the barracks, and the completion of the batteries; at Antwerp, the continuations of the rapid works, which are to form the arsenal of our marine, on the North Sea, the erection of quays and work-shops; in the road of Rochefort, the jetties on which Fort Bayard is to be erected, and the operations of every kind required by this difficult construction.—Eleven other points have constantly had works in activity; Ostend, for the completion of the batteries, and the formation of a marine hospital; Dunkirk, for cleansing and repairs; Etaples, for the establishment of a powder magazine; Havre, for the maintenance of its establishments; l'Orient, for the erection of an armoury, and the repairs of its buildings; Rochefort, for the repair of the quays, the enclosure of the arsenal, &c.; Toulon, for the construction of the general magazine which was burned, the building for the great masts, and the works for raising four vessels, by which it was obstructed. This port, one of the most beautiful works of art and nature, recovered from its disasters, will soon be free from every vestige of them; the same hand which took it from the enemy, will restore it to its former prosperity.—The erection of 125 weighing machines, 100 of which have already reached the places of their destination, decreed by the laws of the 29th Floreal, year 10, and the 25th Ventôse, year 12, will secure the roads from the injuries committed by the imprudence of carriers, by obliging them to proportion the breadth of their wheels to the weight of their carriages.—Three telegraphic lines are formed to Brest, Brussels, and Strasburgh; and branches to Boulogne and Cape Grinez. A fourth line will, in six months, extend to Milan, through Lyons and Turin.—The organization of bridges and causeways, established on a plan more extensive, and more regular, decreed in the year 12, and executed in the year 13, insures pensions to old age, rewards to services, advancement to merit, and encouragement to all the engineers; and proportions that corps, throughout the whole extent of France, to the system of the public works.—Two new cities are rising in the bosom of a country, formerly desolated by civil war, and too long a stranger to our commerce, and to our arts, as well as to our manners. Its whole population was fixed upon the

coasts; the interior will now be enlivened. In Morbihan, Napoleonville is proceeding upon the plans decreed this year; it is already advanced. Military structures and civil edifices are erecting there—the Lyceum is ready for the reception of one hundred and fifty pupils. Situated in the centre of the new canals of ci-devant Bretagne, Napoleonville will, in peace, be the centre of an extended commerce; in war, an imposing military centre, a dépôt for the equipment of our marine. La Vendée hails the birth of its new capital; the city of Napoleon has beheld the foundations laid for all the great establishments which are suited to its destiny, and are capable of vivifying the department, of which it is the centre. Issuing from a forest, formerly deserted, it will summon the bustle of commerce, by the roads that will cross each other under its walls; it will behold its happy situation resorted to, by a population, faithful and devoted to the Prince, who has restored to it, religion, tranquillity, and abundance.—The Emperor has given permission for his name to be impressed on those two magnificent works, as on two unperishable medals; they will revive the recollection of great calamities completely retrieved.—But here, and it is necessary to declare it boldly to the nation, that its safety requires that a numerous army should be kept on foot; that fleets should be constructed, and seamen raised to protect our commerce, our colonies, and our rights. These circumstances require productive finances. The Emperor thinks eight hundred millions will be necessary in time of war, and upwards of six hundred during peace; as the fate of a country should never be left to the mercy of an obscure plot, nor any intrigue of a cabinet; but in all cases, it should be ready to make head against any storm, and silence the jealous clamours of its enemies.—It is the will of the Emperor, as well as the desire of the whole nation, to augment our navy; and, as we lost some ships in the late engagements, it is a new motive for redoubling our ardour. A great number of our cruizers are scouring the seas, and have attacked the commerce of our enemies in the remotest regions. Our whole flotilla shall shortly revive by the return to its banks of the conquerors of Ulm and Austerlitz. But all those warlike measures shall be nothing more than measures to peace, and even of a moderate peace, in which we shall secure the pledge of not being surprised and seized upon under the most vain and perfidious pretences; it were otherwise better to endure still the miseries of war, rather than make a peace which



would expose us to new losses, and afford fresh aliment to the bad faith and avarice of our enemies.—The union of Piedmont with France, two years ago, rendered necessary the union of Genoa, which is a part of it. That of the city of Genoa, for a long time occupied by the French, and defended by them during the second coalition, is a consequence of the will and independence of that republic. This union does not increase our strength on the Continent; England alone had the right to complain of it; nor was it the cause of the war just terminated. The union took place in June, and in the month of April, the cabinet of Petersburg had been seduced by the intrigues of England. The abasement of France, the dispossessing her of her provinces, was decreed. It was not only the kingdom of Italy, of which they would have deprived us; Piedmont, Savoy, the Duchy of Nice, even Lyons, and the united departments, Holland, Belgium, the fortresses on the Meuse, these were the conquests prescribed to the confederates by England; and to this they certainly would not have confined themselves, if they had triumphed over the perseverance of the French people.—England attaches no great interest to Italy. Belgium is the true ground of the hatred which she bears to us.—But Holland, the hundred and ten departments of France, the kingdom of Italy, Venice, Dalmatia, Istria, and Naples, are now under the protection of the Imperial Eagle: and the union of those states only affords us the means of being formidable on our frontiers and coast.—Bavaria, Wirtemberg, Baden, and several of the principal powers of Germany, are our allies.—Spain, firm to its purpose, has manifested a laudable diligence, valour, and fidelity.—In former wars, England and Russia had promised the Emperor of Austria an augmentation in Italy, to draw him into war; but that Monarch, better informed of the state of things, has acknowledged the danger of being in alliance with England, and leaves all the affairs of Italy to France: having merely gained re-possession of his states through the moderation and magnanimity of the Emperor, he knows that he can only find in the friendship of France, the repose and happiness which his subjects want more than any other nation in Europe.—The Emperor of Russia, unable to do us harm, will feel, that the true policy of his country is concentered in the friendship of France; every thing, as well as his genuine glory, is

concentered in the liberation of the seas, and in the refusal to recognise principles which are detrimental even to the smallest states, and which has led them to sustain bombardments and blockades, rather than submit to acknowledge these principles.—The Emperor, after each victory, offered peace to Austria. He also offered it to Naples before the war—peace violated as soon as sworn, and which has produced the downfall of that house. He also offers it to England. He does not mean to force that power to proceed from the prodigious changes made in India, as little as Austria and Russia from the partition of Poland; but he has a right to refuse to recede from the alliances and unions which form the new federative systems of the French empire.—Turkey has continued under the yoke of Russia; and it was the Emperor's chief aim, by getting Dalmatia into his hands, to be ready to protect the most ancient of our allies, and to enable him to maintain his independence, which is of more importance to France than to any other power.—The first coalition, terminated by the treaty of Campo Formio, had the favourable issue for France of the acquisition of Belgium, the frontier-separation of the Rhine, the bringing of Holland under the federative influence of France, and the conquest of the states now forming the kingdom of Italy.—The second coalition gave it Piedmont; the third brings Venice and Naples under the federative system.—Let England be finally convinced of her imbecility: let her not try to operate a fourth coalition, if it were, in the nature of things, possible to renew it.—Such have been the exertions of government for the glory and prosperity of France; the Emperor looks only to what remains to be done, which he considers as superior to what he has already performed; but it is not conquest that he projects. He has exhausted military glory. He wants none of those bloody laurels, which he has been compelled to gather.—To perfect the public administration; to make it a source of lasting happiness for his people, as well as of an increasing prosperity; to render his acts the lesson and the example of a pure and elevated morality; to merit the blessings not only of the present, but future generations, whose interests ever occupy his mind: such is the glory which he aims to possess; such is the recompence which he promises himself, for a life devoted to the most noble, but, at the same time, the most painful duties.